arXiv:1407.3245v4 [physics.gen-ph] 31 Oct 2015

29 October, 2015

Looking for a Theory of Faster-Than-Light Particles

V.F. Perepelitsa
ITEP, Moscow

Abstract

Several principal aspects of a theoretical approach to the theory of faster-than-light particles (tachyons) are considered in this note. They concern the resolution of such problems of tachyon theory as the causality violation by tachyons, the stability of the tachyon vacuum, and the stability of ordinary particles against the spontaneous emission of tachyons, i.e. the problems which are generally used as arguments against the possibility of such particles. It is demonstrated that all these arguments contain nontrivial loopholes which undermine their validity. A demand for a consistent tachyon theory is formulated, and several ideas for its construction are suggested.

1 Introduction

This note presents a consideration of several problems related to faster-than-light particles: particles with spacelike momenta, called tachyons. They are listed below:

1. Violation of causality by tachyons.

2. Instability of the tachyon vacuum.

3. Violation of unitarity by interacting tachyons.

Usually these problems serve as arguments against the possibility of the existence of such particles. Each of the arguments considered separately looks valid, but taken together they, most probably, are wrong.

It is the aim of this note to show how all these problems can be solved in the frame of standard physics via a non-standard approach. This approach, formulated in parallel with the problems under consideration, is based on the properties of faster-than-light particles which look quite natural from an unbiased point of view, though separate tachyons into a class of rather unusual objects in the particle world.

The first theoretical arguments for the possibility of the existence of particles with spacelike momenta[1], $P^2 < 0$, can be found in a famous paper by Wigner in which the classification of unitary irreducible representations (UIR's) of the Poincaré group was done for the first time [1]. In this work Wigner used for the classification of the UIR's two Casimir invariants of the Poincaré group, one of which is the particle four-momentum squared, P^2. Three classes of the UIR's were distinguished by the values of this Casimir invariant, one of them having $P^2 > 0$ corresponding to ordinary massive particles, the second class having $P^2 = 0$ corresponding to massless particles (to photons and probably to some sort of neutrinos[2]), and the third class with $P^2 < 0$. Every class is generated by a corresponding subgroup of the Poincaré group which is called *a little group*. The little group describing the third class of representations is a group of rotations in 2+1 dimensions denoted by $O(2,1)$. The UIR's of this group were obtained and analysed a little bit later by V. Bargmann [3].

In the 1960's Wigner returned to discuss the UIR's of the Poincaré group corresponding to particles with spacelike momenta [4]. He has shown that quantum mechanical equations corresponding to these UIR's describe particles with imaginary rest mass moving faster than light. This almost coincided in time with the appearance of two seminal works in which the hypothesis of faster-than-light particles was formulated explicitly, accompanied by a kinematic description of them [5] (see Appendix A) and by a quantum field theory of scalar tachyons[6]. The particles were called *tachyons*, from the Greek word $\tau\alpha\chi\iota\sigma$ meaning $swift$ [6].

These propositions immediately encountered strong objections related to the causality principle. It has been shown in several papers [7, 8, 9], in agreement with an earlier remark by Einstein [10] (see also [11, 12, 13]), that by using tachyons as information carriers one can build a causal loop, making possible the information transfer to the past of an observer.

[1]We denote 4-vectors by ordinary italic type; boldface type is used to denote 3-vectors when it is necessary to avoid confusion.

[2]Indeed this class was presented in [1] by two subclasses: $P^2 = 0$ with not all P components being zero, and $P^2 = 0$ with all P components being zero. The UIRs of the latter subclass have been analysed in [2]; they cannot have particle interpretation, but a vacuum state may be represented by them.

This is deduced from the apparent ability of tachyons to move backward in time, which happens when they have a negative energy provided by a suitable Lorentz transformation, this property of tachyons being a consequence of the spacelikeness of their four-momenta. A consensus was achieved that within the special relativity faster-than-light particles are incompatible with the principle of causality.

Another important problem related to tachyons concerns the stability of the tachyon vacuum. It is generally believed that any field theory containing a negative mass-squared term in the Lagrangian has no stable ground state (a vacuum) until the field is re-arranged converting tachyons into ordinary particles with positive mass squared (for an instructive description of the problem see e.g. [14]). This belief comes from consideration of numerous models of spontaneous symmetry breaking, the most famous being the Higgs model. Applied in a straightforward manner to consideration of faster-than-light particles it results in a maximum (instead of a minimum) of the Hamiltonian for tachyon zero field, and leads to the conclusion that the existence of tachyons as free particles is not possible.

Fortunately, both problems turned out to be mutually connected and were resolved in the 1970's - 1980's.

The causality problem was resolved by the observation that fast tachyons, necessary to build the causal loop (so called transcendent tachyons), are not the objects of special relativity, being compatible, however, with general relativity [15]. Then the situation with the causality violation by tachyons changes drastically since the modern cosmology based on general relativity supplies a preferred reference frame, so called comoving frame, in which e.g. the distribution of matter in the universe, as well the cosmic background (relic) radiation are isotropic, and fast tachyons are extremely sensitive with respect to this frame. In the preferred reference frame tachyons are ordered by the retarded causality and have positively-defined energies. After the causal ordering being established in the preferred frame, no causal loops appear in any other frame.

Furthermore, in parallel with the causal ordering of the tachyon propagation one succeeds to get a stable tachyon vacuum[3], which presents the minimum of the field Hamiltonian and appears, in the preferred frame, to be an ensemble of zero-energy, but finite-momentum, on-mass-shell tachyons propagating isotropically. Thus the space of the preferred frame is spanned by the continuous background of free, zero-energy tachyons; in some respects this is the reincarnation of the ether concept in its tachyonic version.

We have to note that the stability of the tachyon vacuum distinguishes the faster-than-light particles under consideration (i.e. genuine tachyons) from so called "tachyons" appearing in numerous field-theoretical models with a negative mass-squared term in the Lagrangian mentioned above, in which these pseudo-tachyons have no stable vacua and therefore cannot be considered as particle-like objects, i.e. as elementary quantum field excitations above the minimum energy state of the field called vacuum, thus being condemned to disappear as faster-than-light particles.

This note is designed to present the solutions of the aforementioned problems of genuine tachyons and is organized as follows. In Section 2 the causal problem of the faster-than-light particles is described and a way to resolve it is shown. Section 3 addresses the problem of the instability of the tachyon vacuum, and a novel approach to the finding of that vacuum is suggested, which turns out to be closely related to the causality problem solution. Section 4 is devoted to some aspects of tachyon quantum field theories, including

[3]It is possible to reverse this statement arguing that solving the problem of stability of the tachyon vacuum one ensures the causal behaviour of tachyon fields.

the unitarity problem and a non-locality of the tachyon states, which leads, in particular, to a strong suppression of the effects of instability of ordinary particles with respect to the spontaneous emission of tachyons considered in Section 5. Section 6 describes the experimental status of the tachyon hypothesis. Concluding remarks on a suggested approach to the tachyon problems and the note summary are presented in Sections 7, 8.

In formulae used in this note the velocity of light c and the Planck constant $\hbar$ are taken to be equal to 1.

2 Causality problem of faster-than-light signals and its solution

2.1 Causality violation by tachyons in special relativity

Let us present the causal paradox based on superluminal communications inspired by the Tolman-Møller construction [11, 12]. Our presentation of it is given in such a form of an explicit tachyon exchange that excludes any misinterpretations and wrong paradox solutions, e.g. those as given in numerous publications by E. Recami and his coauthors (we refer to a few of them, [16]).

Consider a tachyon exchange between two observers A and B moving with respect to each other with 3-velocity u, each observer being equipped with an emitter and a detector of tachyons, with both emitters being able to emit tachyons having 3-velocities $v > 1/u$ in an arbitrary direction. Let us call such tachyons which force the reinterpretation principle [5] to be applied to them (since both, the time intervals along their path and their energies change their signs when passing from the frame A to the frame B and vice versa) by transcendent tachyons[4]. Let us assume for simplicity that the detection of tachyons (and antitachyons) can be performed by time-of-flight (TOF) systems able to identify tachyons passing through them in any direction, with which the both observer's detectors are equipped. Let us call by a tachyonic event every passage of a tachyon or an antitachyon through the corresponding TOF system of any of the observers[5].

The tachyon exchange is launched by the observer A at the moment $t_0^A = 0$ (let us designate the observer's A and B times by respective superscripts) **if and only if** no any tachyonic event has been observed by him during a time interval of a length T preceding t_0^A (the necessity of this condition will soon become clear) [6] emitting at that moment a (transcendent) tachyon α to the observer B, as Fig. 1a illustrates.

The tachyon α reaches the observer B and is detected by him at the moment t_1^A. But in the frame of the observer B this detection will look like a passage of the antitachyon $\overline{\alpha}$ through the B TOF system directed to A at time t_1^B, the t_1^B being earlier than t_0^B since the tachyon α is a transcendent one (see Fig. 1b).

We insist (and shall prove) that such an ordering of the cause (tachyon emission at t_0) and its effect (the tachyon passage through the detector of the observer B), with the

[4]Thus transcendent tachyons are those which cross the boundary $E = 0$ under proper continuous Lorentz transformations, see formula A.3 in Appendix A.

[5]Instead of a single tachyon (or antitachyon) one can assume a faster-than-light signal of an arbitrary complicated structure, e.g. modulated tachyonic beam.

[6]The value $T \geq D$, where D is a distance between the observers at t_0^A is sufficient for any set of the velocities u and v implemented in the process under consideration.

effect occurring before its cause as it is seen in the frame B, even being strange, does not mean, contrary to the general belief, any causality violation yet.

Here we have to specify what is the causality and to define what is its violation.




Fig. 1. Exchange by a tachyon α as seen a) by an observer A to be an emission of this tachyon launched by him to reach an observer B, and b) as seen by the observer B to be a spontaneous emission of an antitachyon $\overline{\alpha}$ moving to the observer A. The observer's world lines are shown by solid lines, those for tachyons are shown by dashed ones. The "dead time interval" preceding to the emission of the tachyon α at $t_0^A = 0$ is indicated by a wave line.

Of the many notions of the causal relations we select a single one, which can be formulated in two words: action→ result. This, almost tautological definition, will be sufficient for our analysis of the causal problem related with faster-than-light signals while makes its straightforward. Action and result (the cause and effect) are related by a causal chain: by a beam of world lines of matter[7] which has no interruptions either in time or space. The existence of this material chain is an invariant thing: occurring in one reference frame it happens in any other frame. By definition, information flow goes from the cause to the effect, and this direction is also invariant whatever their time ordering could be (i.e. whether we deal with a routine retarded causality or, e.g., with a hypothetical advanced causality in the spirit of Wheeler-Feynman absorption theory). The causal relations are governed by an extremely hard logical principle which is called *the causality principle:* any cause has an unalterable own origin. In physical language the causality principle is a requirement of the impossibility of creation of causal loops, i.e. the causal chains containing closed world lines.

That is all. Nothing is required in the relevance of what the time ordering of a cause and its effect should be. For example, if the observer B in our story, having obtained the

[7]Here we understand under the term matter any action carriers, e.g. photons or even gravitation if one includes consideration of Newton's apple.

tachyon signal from the future (but from the space-like separated region), as shown in Fig. 1b, could not produce any influence to the signal sending (namely, to the emission of tachyon α), i.e. the observer A would be inaccessible to the observer B, after detecting by the latter the tachyonic signal α, during a whole interval T preceding the t_0^A, then no problem with causality would appear.

Unfortunately, this is not the case for the story under consideration. The observer B in our example has an access to the observer A during the above interval since he has a tachyon emitter equivalent to that of the observer A. So, at the time t_2^B (see Fig. 2b) he sends a faster-than-light signal (tachyon β) towards the observer A. If the velocity of the tachyon β in the B frame is higher than that of the antitachyon $\overline{\alpha}$ the trajectory of the tachyon β intersects the trajectory of the antitachyon $\overline{\alpha}$ somewhere in the space between the B and A, and then tachyon β will reach the observer A and will be detected by him at the time t_3 which, in the both frames, precedes the time t_0. One can see that the possibility of a causal loop is realized.




Fig. 2. A causal loop (the Tolman-Møller paradox) as seen a) in the frame of the observer A and b) in the frame of the observer B.

Let us consider it in the frame of the observer A (Fig. 2a). He will detect a tachyonic event (passage of an antitachyon $\overline{\beta}$ through its TOF system[8]) at the time t_3^A, i.e. inside the time interval T preceding the launching time t_0^A. But the mandatory condition for launching the tachyon α was the absence of any tachyonic event during that interval! We have an unsolvable logical paradox, which was the main reason of a rejection of the possibility of faster-than-light signals during a century, beginning since Einstein's formulation of this rejection [10].

In fact, the base stone of the causal paradox constructed above is the 2nd postulate of the special relativity declaring the equivalence of all inertial frames, which in our

[8]It is easy to prove that tachyon β which is faster (in the frame B) than the transcendent antitachyon $\overline{\alpha}$, also is a transcendent tachyon, i.e. it changes the sign of its energy when transformed to the frame A.

example was realized via the possibility for all observers to have tachyon emitters able to emit tachyons having arbitrarily large velocities, in particular $v > 1/u$, in an arbitrary direction. As we shall see in the next section, this base stone turns out to be rather vulnerable when dealing with transcendent tachyons.

But before going to that, three principal statements can be formulated at the end of this section as its key points:

1. Causality is an invariant entity which relates an effect and its cause in a certain (invariant) way.

2. There is no explicit causality violation if an effect precedes its cause in time if this "wrong" ordering takes place in spacelike separated regions. However there is a possibility of the causality violation if the wrong ordering takes places in timelike separated regions, e.g. when a causal loop can be constructed.

3. Within special relativity there is a clear method to design a causal loop with tachyons (e.g. via the Tolman-Møller construction) which excludes, within this theory, any chance for the existence of such particles able to serve as carriers of faster-than-light signals.

2.2 Tachyons in an expanding universe

Meanwhile, a realistic approach to tachyons shows that they can avoid this prohibitive sentence, appearing to be faster-than-light objects not obeying the special relativity, respecting however the laws of the general relativity. In this section we shall demonstrate how modern cosmology based on general relativity treats tachyons in the expanding universe and prove that the use of the transcendent tachyons for building the causal paradoxes within the special relativity approach is illegal.

There is a strict criterion defining the limit of the application of the special relativity in a given analysis called the geodesic deviation criterion. It is formulated as follows [17].

Separate a space-time region in which you can carry out the measurements of trajectories of your test particles with an accuracy of $\nabla\xi$. Then trace in this region a free motion of test particles (their geodesics) with initially parallel world lines. If the world lines remain parallel within $\nabla\xi$ for any direction of the particle motion, you can state that the space-time of your region is a Minkovskian one, i.e. a flat and static space-time of special relativity, at least with an accuracy down to $\nabla\xi$. If it is not the case, you can either use an accurate general relativity approach, or remain within special relativity with the measured inaccuracy regarded as admissible.

However a situation is possible when the initially parallel geodesics deviate drastically. This means that you have encountered some singularity, either of the space-time, or behaviour of your test particles. In both cases you have no choice and are obliged to use the general relativity approach in your analysis.

Let us apply this criterion to the motion of faster-than-light test particles, first considering them classically, i.e. associating with them spacelike geodesics. How do such geodesics behave in our expanding universe?

For the first time this problem was addressed by Davies [18]; a throughout analysis of it was done a little bit later by Narlikar and Sudarshan [19]. They have shown that

tachyons in the expanding universe undergo a cosmological red shift of the same type as the ordinary particles, so the expression

$$pa = const \tag{2.1}$$

is valid. Here p is a tachyon 3-momentum, and a is the scale factor in the metrics of the expanding universe: using spherical coordinates a line element ds^2 in the isotropic universe can be written as

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - \frac{dr^2}{1 \pm \frac{r^2}{a^2}} - r^2(\sin^2\theta d\phi^2 + d\theta^2), \tag{2.2}$$

where signs + and − are for open and closed universes, respectively. The equality (2.1) is obtained solving the spacelike geodesics equations. In general coordinate form they look as follows:

$$\frac{d^2x^\mu}{ds^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho}\frac{dx^\nu}{ds}\frac{dx^\rho}{ds} = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

where μ, ν, ρ run over 0,1,2,3, and $\Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho}$ are Christoffel symbols.

Introducing the coordinate χ according to $r = a\sinh\chi$ and $r = a\sin\chi$ for open and closed universes, respectively, and using instead of the time a quantity η defined by the relation

$$dt = ad\eta \tag{2.4}$$

in the spirit of [20], we obtain for the line element the expression

$$ds^2 = a^2(\eta)\ [d\eta^2 - d\chi^2 - \sinh^2\chi(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2)]. \tag{2.5}$$

in the case of an open universe, with the term $\sinh^2\chi$ being replaced by $\sin^2\chi$ in the case of a closed universe. From the symmetry arguments we can restrict our analysis to the two-dimensional case:

$$ds^2 = a^2(\eta)\ (d\eta^2 - d\chi^2), \tag{2.6}$$

valid for both, the closed and the open universes, as well as for the flat one. Then we have for non-zero $\Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho}$'s the following relations:

$$\Gamma^0_{00} = \Gamma^0_{11} = \Gamma^1_{10} = \Gamma^1_{01} = \frac{a'}{a}\ , \tag{2.7}$$

where the prime denotes differentiation over η. Thus equations (2.3) reduce to

$$\frac{d^2\eta}{ds^2} + \frac{a'}{a}\Big[\Big(\frac{d\eta}{ds}\Big)^2 + \Big(\frac{d\chi}{ds}\Big)^2\Big] = 0 \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$\frac{d^2\chi}{ds^2} + 2\frac{a'}{a}\frac{d\eta}{ds}\frac{d\chi}{ds} = 0. \tag{2.9}$$

The integration of (2.9) gives

$$\frac{d\chi}{ds}a^2 = const = -iA_d, \tag{2.10}$$

where A_d is a real constant since ds is imaginary, which together with the definition of the tachyon 3-momentum

$$p = i\mu\frac{ad\chi}{ds} \tag{2.11}$$

leads to (2.1).

With (2.10) equation (2.8) integrates to

$$\frac{d\eta}{ds} = \pm\frac{1}{a}\sqrt{1 - \frac{A_d^2}{a^2}}. \tag{2.12}$$

Defining the tachyon energy $E = i\mu\frac{ad\eta}{ds}$ we get, after choosing the negative sign in (2.12),

$$E = \mu\sqrt{\frac{A_d^2}{a^2} - 1}. \tag{2.13}$$

In the expanding universe the parameter $a = a(\eta)$ increases monotonically, thus it follows from (2.1), (2.13) that the tachyon momentum and energy are decreasing with the universe expansion. This is a behaviour which looks very similar to that of ordinary particles, but in the case of tachyons it has a drastic distinction: sooner or later tachyon momenta decrease to the value of $p = \mu$ and will tend to decrease further. But for real tachyons their momenta cannot become below μ. So, what happens with a tachyon when its momentum reaches the limit of $p = \mu$ at η equal to, say, η_d?

Let us assume that our universe at early times was filled with relic tachyons created during the Big Bang[9]. To make the picture symmetrical let us suppose that for every tachyon an antitachyon of the same energy moving in the opposite direction existed somewhere. Evolving accordingly to the law (2.1) all these tachyons, as follows from the tachyon vacuum model derived in Sect. 3.2, dissolve (disappear) in the vacuum at η_d.

Here we have to invoke a bit of a quantum mechanical consideration of the tachyon behaviour in the expanding universe; for the first time it was given in [19] and starts as follows.

The Klein-Gordon equation for tachyons in the expanding universe is solved. Its solutions at $\eta < \eta_d$ present functions oscillating in time, typically as $\exp(-iEt)$. But for $\eta > \eta_d$ the solutions become damped (which can be seen also from the fact that the tachyon energy (2.13) becomes imaginary at $a > A_d$, i.e. at $\eta > \eta_d$), with the characteristic damping time given by $(\mu^2 H_d)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, where H_d is the Hubble constant at η_d (with $\mu = 1$ GeV the damping time today would be 5×10^{-11} s). As we shall see in Sect. 3.2, the transition of tachyons to the vacuum state (tachyon "dissolution" in the vacuum) at the tachyon momenta reaching μ agrees well with the tachyon vacuum model obtained in that section.

However, just at this point our interpretation of the tachyon behaviour in the expanding universe starts to differ essentially from that proposed by Narlikar and Sudarshan. They believe that the tachyon trajectory at $\eta = \eta_d$ bends back in time (with the tachyon energy becoming negative) and then propagates in counter-time direction, so the whole

[9]If it would be the case, the tachyons would dominate the early universe by tens of orders of magnitude over the ordinary massive particles due to an infinite number of polarisation states available per tachyon as it follows from the conclusion deduced in Sect. 4 that tachyons, if they exist, have to be realizations of the infinite-dimensional representations of the Poincaré group. The dominance of tachyons in the early universe would lead to a cosmology model of a quite different type as compared to the standard (inflation) cosmology. However the consideration of the tachyon cosmology lies out of scope of this note.

process looks as an annihilation at η_d of a pair of a tachyon and an antitachyon, both being produced previously in spacelike separated regions in a highly correlated manner needed to ensure the above annihilation. Evidently, this immediately rises causal paradoxes, being incompatible also with our treatment of the problem described below (Sect. 2.3), and leads to a conclusion about inevitability of the tachyon dissolution in the vacuum at η_d.

Let us return to the classical consideration of spacelike geodesics approaching the limit of $p = \mu$. Assuming the possibility of tachyon production not only in the early universe but in the present epoch too, let us guess what would be the length R of a trajectory of a tachyon until it reaches the "time" of damping η_d (when its dissolution in the vacuum occurs), in dependence on the initial momentum p_0 of the tachyon produced at η_0.

In order to answer this question we need the explicit form of the scale factor a:

$$a = a_0(\cosh\eta - 1), \quad a = a_0(1 - \cos\eta) \tag{2.14}$$

for the open and closed universes. At small η the relation

$$a = \frac{a_0}{2}\eta^2 \tag{2.15}$$

approximates a for both, the closed and open universes, as well as for the flat one. Assuming that this approximation is still valid at the present epoch and noting that $ad\chi = dr$ in this case, we rewrite (2.10) as

$$-iA_d = a\frac{dr}{ds} = a\frac{dr}{d\eta}\frac{d\eta}{ds} \tag{2.16}$$

and using (2.12) obtain

$$dr = \frac{aA_d}{\sqrt{A_d^2 - a^2}}d\eta \tag{2.17}$$

From the tachyon momentum definition (2.11) and relation (2.10) it follows that

$$\mu A_d = p_0 A_0, \tag{2.18}$$

where A_0 is the scale factor a at η_0. Substituting $A_d = A_0\frac{p_0}{\mu}$ followed from (2.18) to (2.17) we obtain for the length R the following expression:

$$R(p_0) = \int_{\eta_0}^{\eta_d} \frac{aA_d}{\sqrt{A_d^2 - a^2}}d\eta = \frac{a_0\eta_0^3 p_0}{2\mu}\left(\sqrt{\frac{p_0}{\mu}}S + \sqrt{\frac{p_0 - \mu}{p_0 + \mu}}\right) \tag{2.19}$$

since

$$\eta_d = \sqrt{\frac{2A_d}{a_0}} = \eta_0\sqrt{\frac{p_0}{\mu}}. \tag{2.20}$$

S in (2.19) is a superposition of elliptic integrals which can be reduced to

$$S = \int_{\phi_0}^{\pi/2} \frac{\cos^2\alpha d\alpha}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2}\sin^2\alpha}}, \tag{2.21}$$

where ϕ_0 is $\sin^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{2\eta_0^2}{\eta_0^2+\eta_d^2}}$. The curve (2.19) is plotted in Fig. 3. The prominent feature of this curve is the singularity of its derivative at $p_0 \to \mu$, that is at the tachyon energy

approaching zero (namely, developing a pole $\sim 1/E$), coming from the second term in expression (2.19), while the derivative of the first term in this expression smoothly vanishes at that moment.




Fig. 3. Tachyon trajectory length (from the production of a tachyon to its "dissolution" in the vacuum) in the expanding universe *vs* the tachyon initial momentum p_0.

This means that the spacelike geodesics starting with close p_0's at η_0 deviate strongly at the end of their trajectory. According to the geodesics deviation criterion introduced at the beginning of this section, this makes the zero-energy boundary for tachyons propagating in the expanding universe to be the "no go" limit of the special relativity approach with a consequence that the transcendent tachyons, which have to cross this boundary under the application of the Lorentz transformations, cannot be used as a legitimate material for building the causal paradoxes with faster-than-light signals. In the next subsection we consider the solution of these paradoxes respecting this "no go" limit.

2.3 Causal ordering of faster-than-light signals

We have considered tachyon behaviour in the cosmological environment and have seen that fast tachyons must be treated with care since they are very sensitive to the cosmological

properties of the universe. Unfortunately, an important role of the reference system in this treatment has been hidden; in order to unveil it we shall give two fragments of a text from the book by Landau and Lifshitz "The Classical Theory of Fields", the fragments being devoted to the concept of a system of reference in general relativity and, in particular, in cosmology.

Such a system is not "a set of bodies at rest relative to one another in unchanging relative positions... for exact determination of the position of a particle in space we must, strictly speaking, have an infinite number of bodies which fill all the space like some sort of "medium". Such a system of bodies with arbitrary running clocks fixed on them constitutes a reference system in the general theory of relativity.

In connection with the arbitrariness of the choice of a reference system, the laws of nature must be written in the general relativity in a form which is appropriate in any four-dimensional system of coordinates (or, as one says, in "*covariant*" form). This, of course, does not imply the physical equivalence of all these reference systems (like the physical equivalence of all inertial reference systems in the special theory). On the contrary, the specific appearances of physical phenomena, including the properties of the motion of bodies, become different in all systems of reference." [21]

For example, when considering the phenomena related to cosmological effects their "specific appearance" looks the most clear in the reference system connected to the universe as a whole, which becomes a natural preferred reference frame for this consideration. An instructive definition of this preferred frame is given in [20]:

"The most convenient is a "co-moving" reference system, moving, at each point in space, along with matter located at that point. In other words, the reference system is just the matter filling the space; the velocity of the matter in this system is by definition zero everywhere. It is clear that this reference system is reasonable for the isotropic model of the universe - for any other choice the direction of the velocity of the matter would lead to an apparent nonequivalence of different directions in space...

In view of the complete equivalence of all directions, the components $g_{0\alpha}$ of the metric tensor are equal to zero in the reference system we have chosen. Namely, the three components $g_{0\alpha}$ can be considered as the components of a three-dimensional vector which, if it were different from zero, would lead to a nonequivalence of different directions. Thus ds^2 must have the form $ds^2 = g_{00}(dx^0)^2 - dl^2$."

Just such a form have linear elements (2.2), (2.5), (2.6) which were used in our analysis of the spacelike geodesics "appearance", i.e. the analysis was carried out in the preferred reference frame defined above. To fix labels let us prescribe it to the system of the observer A in Sect. 2.1. Had we chose for the analysis the coordinate frame B moving with respect to the preferred one with the velocity u then, accordingly to [20, 21], a term proportional to $2u\ dt\ dr$ would appear in (2.2), a term proportional to $2u\ a^2\ d\eta\ d\chi$ in (2.5), etc.

Our example of spacelike geodesics terminating their trajectories in the expanding universe rather dramatically shows that the mathematical apparatus of general relativity has to be applied in order to manage fast tachyons. This does not mean however that tachyons should be treated always on an equal footing with such objects of general relativity as black holes, clusters of galaxies, etc. But at least one step beyond special relativity has to be done when dealing with tachyons: we have to abandon the second postulate of special relativity declaring the equivalence of all inertial frames and replace it by a postulate of the existence of a preferred reference frame, to be a frame in which tachyon energy cannot become negative.

This means that reaching the zero energy level via any energy-decreasing process tachyons cannot tend to a further energy decrease, but must disappear at $E = 0$ due to a damping of their wave functions when going beyond this limit as has been noted above. Then no causal paradoxes involving tachyons can be built in the preferred reference frame since no material for their building (negative energy, counter-time tachyons) exists there[10].

However, there is a statement in the literature that the introduction of the preferred reference frame does not save the tachyon hypothesis from the causality violation in the expanding universe [22]. Two observers, both residing in the preferred frame but separated by some cosmologically significant distances, move one relative to another in the expanding universe. As stated in [22] this is the precise situation that leads to causality paradoxes: by means of sufficiently fast tachyons the observers can conspire to send messages into their past.

This argument becomes wrong in our approach. As illustrates Fig. 3 the maximal distance passed by tachyons having the initial momenta p_0 in the expanding universe is $R(p_0)$. If it is less than the separation between the observers the tachyons under consideration never reach the opposed observer[11]; if it is greater, the arrived tachyons will still have a positive energy, supplying no material for the building of a causal paradox. Trivially, this is a direct consequence of the definition of a preferred reference frame as a frame in which no negative energy tachyons can appear.

Thus we may emphasize once more the clue property of the preferred reference frame: it is the frame in which the cause and effect are ordered by retarded causality. In other frames this may not be valid if tachyons do exist, however no casual loops can appear in them. This can be easily proved by noting that if a causal loop has appeared in some non-preferred frame, this would mean its appearance in the preferred frame which contradicts the definition of the latter introduced above. This follows from the fact that any causal loop contains a timelike piece of the world line, on the edges of which a cause and effect are ordered in a wrong way (the effect precedes the cause). Since no proper coordinate transformation can change the sign of a time interval along a timelike world line this wrong ordering would be conserved in the preferred reference frame too.

Now we have to make an important remark.

The postulate of the preferred reference frame, induced by a general-relativistic consideration of tachyons, can be accommodated easily in a flat and static space-time, i.e. in the Minkowski space-time, thus conserving the viability of the Lorentz group. Really, the derivation of the Lorentz transformations is based on the requirement of invariance of the interval (a line element in four-dimensional space-time in the form $ds^2 = dt^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2$) when passing from one inertial frame to another [23]. The presence or the absence of the preferred reference frame among frames under consideration does not affect the derivation in any extent, while the introduction of the preferred frame to the Minkowski space can be considered as an asymptotic influence of the real world on that space. In view of this possibility to retain the Lorentz group when treating tachyons, free of causal violations, all the considerations which follow below will be restricted to a

[10]In frames moving with respect to the preferred one the tachyon damping can occur at nonzero energies due to appearance of terms $g_{0\alpha}$ in the metrics, at both, positive and negative tachyon energies. Nevertheless, as will be shown below, no causal loops can appear in the moving frames too.

[11] We have to note that the situation suggested by Walstad, i.e. an arrival of tachyons going back in time to cosmologically separated observers could indeed occur if one adopts the proposition by Narlikar and Sudarshan postulating the bending of the tachyon trajectories back in time as mentioned in Sect 2.2.

flat and static space-time, nevertheless with the preferred reference frame being involved in them to provide the above freedom.

First, one can find, within a quite general approach, a law ensuring the causality conservation independently on what is a time entanglement of causes and effects in various reference frames.

This law has to keep a causal order of the signal propagation along the causal chain, i.e. to control the transfer of the matter throughout the chain. Due to invariant properties of the causality it must be formulated in a covariant form, its mathematical expression having to be a scalar relation which governs the signal propagation.

Within the special relativity we have a single four-vector which can be used for the aim of the causal ordering of signals, namely, the 4-momentum of signal carriers P, and the causal condition can be written as

$$P^2 \geq 0, \tag{2.22}$$

which is equivalent to the statement "cause always precedes effect in time" expressed mathematically. Thus we can see again that within special relativity no faster-than-light signals are admissible.

But the postulate of the preferred reference frame supplies us with the second four-vector which can be used in the causal ordering formula, the four-velocity of the preferred reference frame with respect to an observer, U ($U = (1, \mathbf{u})/\sqrt{1-u^2}$), so that formula can be written as follows:

$$(PU) \geq 0. \tag{2.23}$$

In three-vector form this *boundary condition* leads to the restriction

$$(\mathbf{vu}) \leq 1. \tag{2.24}$$

This is just the condition necessary to destroy the causal loops described above. Thus with (2.23) the causality can be ensured, while the faster-than-light signals appear to be allowed (how the formula (2.24) works will be explained in Sect. 3.2).

It is interesting to consider a particular case of expression (2.23), the equality

$$(PU) = 0. \tag{2.25}$$

In the preferred reference frame the four-vector $U = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. Thus, in this frame the four-vector P satisfying (2.25) cannot have non-zero time component, i.e. it corresponds to a zero-energy tachyon propagating at infinite speed. As we have postulated above and shall prove later (Sect 3.2) the condition (2.25) is indeed a gauge fixing the tachyon vacuum.

Also it will be shown in Sect. 4.1 that the abandoning of the principle of the equivalence of all inertial frames can be done without any damage for the description of physical processes by the Standard Model, if only the ordinary particles are involved in them. This principle simply has to be replaced by a requirement of a relativistically covariant description of all physical processes, allowing to include those with the interacting tachyons. Furthermore, it may be postulated that a theory of such tachyons, being formulated in the preferred reference frame in which all the processes (including both, tachyons and ordinary particles) are ordered by the retarded causality, has to look as similar to the standard one as possible, thus constituting the respective correspondence principle.

3 Problem of tachyon vacuum instability and its solution

It is quite surprising that the introduction of a preferred reference frame into the tachyon hypothesis helps to solve the next serious problem of it, the problem of the instability of the tachyon vacuum which will be considered in this section.

3.1 Standard treatment of the problem

Consider, as a toy model, a free non-Hermitian scalar tachyon field with the Lorentz-invariant Lagrangian:

$$L = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big[\dot{\phi}^*(x)\dot{\phi}(x) - \nabla\phi^*(x)\nabla\phi(x) + \mu^2\phi^*(x)\phi(x)\Big] \tag{3.1}$$

The Hamiltonian of this field obtained as usual

$$H = -L + \dot{\phi}\frac{\partial L}{\partial\dot{\phi}} \tag{3.2}$$

reads

$$H = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big[\dot{\phi}^*(x)\dot{\phi}(x) + \nabla\phi^*(x)\nabla\phi(x) - \mu^2\phi^*(x)\phi(x)\Big]. \tag{3.3}$$

Now, if a finite value of the ϕ which minimizes the Hamiltonian can be found, it will represent the ground state of the field called vacuum.

A standard approach to finding the minimum of the Hamiltonian (3.3), $\delta H = 0$, is reduced to an analysis of the potential term of (3.3), which assumes, implicitly, that the search for the ground state of the Hamiltonian is replaced by looking for its minimum under restrictions conditioned by the Lorentz-invariant pair of the "initial" conditions on the vacuum:

$$\phi = const\ in\ time, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\phi = uniform\ (const)\ in\ space, \tag{3.5}$$

which is an a-priori hopeless exercise since the potential term of (3.3), $V = \int d^3\mathbf{x}(-\mu^2)\phi^*\phi$, has a maximum at $\phi = 0$ instead of the necessary minimum. In the case under consideration (a free tachyon field) this is interpreted as an impossibility (instability) of the tachyon vacuum, while in the models of of the spontaneous symmetry breaking containing additional term(s) in the Lagrangian, say $\lambda\phi^4$, this results in a transition of the field to the true ground state accompanied, after the re-arrangement of the field accordingly to the new vacuum, by disappearance of the initial tachyon converted to an ordinary particle.

This mechanism, so loved by theoreticians, works perfectly in models of the spontaneous symmetry breaking, but it is not applicable to the faster-than-light particles.

3.2 Stability of the tachyon vacuum

As we have seen, the hypothesis of the faster-than-light particles requires consideration of tachyons under a postulate of a preferred reference frame which is necessary for the causal ordering of the signals propagating over the spacelike intervals. This requirement must be respected by the procedure of the tachyon ground state finding also. Therefore the

Lorentz-invariant pair of the initial conditions (3.4), (3.5) must be replaced by a single, Lorentz-non-invariant one:

$$\phi = const\ in\ time \tag{3.6}$$

which separates, obviously, the preferred reference frame. Then the Hamiltonian which has to be analysed in the search for the ground state will contain, together with the potential term, a gradient energy term to be read

$$H = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big[\nabla\phi^*(\mathbf{x})\nabla\phi(\mathbf{x}) - \mu^2\phi^*(\mathbf{x})\phi(\mathbf{x})\Big]. \tag{3.7}$$

One can easily obtain the solutions of the equation $\delta H = 0$ directly, but from the pedagogical point of view it is worth to go by a slightly longer path noting that our task to find the variation $\delta H = 0$ coincides now (see 3.2) with the finding the variation $\delta L = 0$, which is just the exercise of finding the (Euler - Lagrange) equation of motion. For the scalar field of the Lagrangian (3.1) it is the Klein-Gordon equation with the negative mass-squared term $-m^2 = \mu^2$:

$$\Big(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \partial_i\partial^i - \mu^2\Big)\phi(x) = 0\ , \qquad i = 1,2,3 \tag{3.8}$$

which has well-known solutions in the form of plane waves $\exp \pm i(Et - \mathbf{px})$ with the dispersion relation [5, 6]

$$E = \sqrt{\mathbf{p^2} - \mu^2}, \qquad |\mathbf{p}| \geq \mu. \tag{3.9}$$

Now we have to require the condition (3.6) to be fulfilled, and this can be easily satisfied by putting $E = 0$ in the obtained solutions, which evidently minimizes the Hamiltonian density in (3.3) to zero value. If, for example, one "pumps" in some way (via interactions) the energy into particular vacuum modes promoting their conversion to real tachyons, the field energy H will be increased correspondingly.

Then the final result of our exercise of finding the tachyon vacuum state (in the preferred reference frame) can be presented as a superposition of plane waves corresponding to mass-shell, zero-energy tachyons propagating isotropically. On the first glance the superposition may appear as the coherent sum of vacuum modes with opposite signs in exponentials,

$$tachyon\ ground\ state(\mathbf{x}) \ \sim \sum_{all\ \ directions} [\exp i(\mathbf{p_0x}) - \exp i(-\mathbf{p_0x})]\ , \tag{3.10}$$

where $\mathbf{p_0}$ is a vacuum tachyon momentum, $|\mathbf{p_0}| = \mu$, while a demand of the translational invariance of the vacuum state leads to the inclusion of the vacuum modes with $\exp i(\mathbf{p_0x})$ and $\exp -i(\mathbf{p_0x})$ in the coherent superposition with the phase shift equal to π.

However, being on the mass shell, i.e. having infinite velocities, the vacuum tachyons immediately escape the place of their appearance, being replaced by other, newly born coherent tachyon-antitachyon vacuum pairs and by vacuum tachyons coming from a remote environment. The result is that the tachyon vacuum wave function has to be presented by an incoherent (stochastic) superposition of the tachyon vacuum modes which can be written, accounting for its normalisation, as:

$$tachyon\ ground\ state(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi}}\int\Big[\exp[i(\mathbf{p_0x} + \xi_\theta)] + \exp[-i(\mathbf{p_0x} + \xi'_\theta)]\Big]d\Omega\ , \tag{3.11}$$

where $d\Omega$ is the element of the solid angle, and phases ξ_θ, ξ'_θ are independent, uniformly distributed random variables in the interval $[0, 2\pi]$. The average of this expression over the phases ξ_θ, ξ'_θ again vanishes.

Schematically, the tachyon vacuum in the preferred reference frame can be presented by a line at $E = 0$ separating hatched and non-hatched regions of tachyon energy, see Fig. 4a. The latter region is the region allowed for real tachyons, i.e. for tachyons having non-zero energy.




Fig. 4. The tachyon vacuum energy levels as seen a) from the preferred reference frame and b) from a frame moving with respect to the preferred one with 3-velocity u. The direction of the preferred frame motion as seen from the (moving) frame B is indicated by an arrow in the top part of b). E_0^+ and E_0^- mark the "forward" and the "backward" tachyon vacuum energy levels in the moving frame given by (3.12) and (3.13). The vertical axes on both figures are for tachyon energies, with the hatched regions to be excluded domains for a proper (without reinterpretation) emission and absorption of tachyons.

It looks like we have obtained a paradoxical result: the tachyon vacuum, filled with on-mass-shell tachyons, has the averaged vacuum four-momentum (0,0,0,0), as it should be for the Lorentz-invariant vacuum. However, being on the mass shell, the vacuum tachyons

will acquire non-zero energies (positive and negative) when we pass to a frame moving with respect to the preferred one. In other words, the tachyon vacuum in the moving frames is asymmetric (i.e. violating the rotational symmetry), as illustrates Fig. 4b: in the direction coinciding with that of the preferred frame velocity the tachyon vacuum boundary will have a positive value:

$$E_0^+ = \frac{\mu u}{\sqrt{1-u^2}}, \tag{3.12}$$

where u is 3-velocity of the preferred frame with respect to the observer, while in the opposite direction the tachyon vacuum boundary will be shifted to the negative value:

$$E_0^- = -\frac{\mu u}{\sqrt{1-u^2}}. \tag{3.13}$$

Just the boundary (3.12) will prevent the observer B of Sects. 2.1, 2.3 from sending the causality-violating signal to the observer A since the maximal tachyon velocity in that direction allowed to him, as can be seen from (3.12) and dispersion relation (3.9), is $1/u$. Thus one can say that all acausal tachyon states get confined in the tachyon vacuum.

In the next section we shall suggest a covariant prescription for such a confinement. But here we would like to emphasize an important property of the tachyon vacuum built in such a manner. Namely, it is invariant, in the following sense: if no real tachyons exist in the preferred reference frame, no such tachyons exist in any other (inertial) frame, and vice versa.

In order to conclude this section, let us compactify all the considerations presented in it via the Lagrange formalism. It can be done modifying the Lagrangian (3.1) by adding to it a Lorentz-non-invariant term proportional to the 4-velocity of the preferred reference frame:

$$L = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big[\dot{\phi}^*(x)\dot{\phi}(x) - \nabla\phi^*(x)\nabla\phi(x) + \mu^2\phi^*(x)\phi(x) - i\lambda U^\mu\partial_\mu[\phi(x)-\phi^*(x)]\Big], \tag{3.14}$$

where λ has the dimensionality of the mass squared. Note that the additional term does not change the equation of motion, so all the results obtained with (3.8) remain valid. Choosing $\lambda = \mu^2$ one gets the corresponding Hamiltonian

$$H = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big[\dot{\phi}^*(x)\dot{\phi}(x) + \nabla\phi^*(x)\nabla\phi(x) - \mu^2\phi^*(x)\phi(x) - \frac{i\mu^2\mathbf{u}}{\sqrt{1-u^2}}\nabla[\phi(x)-\phi^*(x)]\Big]. \tag{3.15}$$

Thus, the additional term in the integrand of (3.15) shifts the tachyon vacuum energy boundaries accordingly to (3.12), (3.13), depending on the direction of the 3-velocity of the preferred reference frame $\mathbf{u}$.

The fact that the Lorentz-non-invariant term in the Lagrangian (3.14) does not change the tachyon equation of motion has several important consequences. A tachyon Feynman propagator, which is, similarly to propagators of ordinary particles, a Green's function for the tachyon equation of motion, will not acquire any Lorentz-non-invariant admixture, and this means that the Lorentz-non-invariance will be restricted, in our model, to the asymptotic-tachyon-states sector only. The importance of this conclusion can be stressed by the result, followed from the fact of the Lorentz-invariance of the tachyon Feynman propagator (which together with the Lorentz-invariance of the Feynman propagators of all other particles, maintained in our model of the Lorentz-invariance violation), that

the speed of light remains an unique, universal velocity constant which limits particle velocities at both sides of the light barrier. In particular, an explicit breaking of the Lorentz symmetry by adding to the Lagrangian the Lorentz-violating term which affects the particle propagators, considered by Coleman and Glashow [24, 25], among many others (which leads to individual maximum attainable velocity for each fundamental field, differing from the velocity of light) is not relevant to our approach. For the same reason the strong restrictions on multiple Lorentz-violating coefficients compiled in the "Data Tables for Lorentz and CPT violation" [26] are not applicable to our considerations.

Note, a thorough review of models violating Lorentz invariance is given in [27]. It contains 281 references. Unfortunately, we do not know whether some of them can be relevant to our approach.

4 Quantum aspects of the tachyon theory which are to be revised

4.1 Confinement of acausal tachyons

Quantum field theories of tachyons like that by G. Feinberg [6], can be easily modified to include the boundary condition (2.23) and the tachyon vacuum gauge (2.25) in the tachyon field operators. So, Feinberg's expression for a scalar tachyon wave function (expression (4.1) in [6]) can be modified as follows:

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int d^4k \, \left[a(k) \exp\left(-ikx\right) + a^+(k) \exp\left(ikx\right)\right] \, \delta(k^2 + \mu^2) \, \theta(kU), \qquad (4.1)$$

where k is a tachyon four-momentum, $a(k), a^+(k)$ are annihilation and creation operators, annihilating or creating tachyonic states with 4-momentum k, and U is a four-velocity of the preferred reference frame with respect to (any particular) frame in which the tachyon field quantization is carried out.

One can see that the expression (4.1) is explicitly Lorentz-covariant. This covariance includes the invariant meaning of the creation and annihilation operators defined in the preferred frame; thus, for example, an annihilation operator $a(k)$ remains an annihilation operator $a(k')$ in the boosted frame, even if the zero component of k' may become negative. This is because the one-sheeted tachyon mass-shell hyperboloid is divided by the covariant boundary $\theta(kU)$ into two parts separated in an invariant way. In particular, the condition (2.25) results in a possibility of the standard operator definition of the invariant vacuum state $|0>$ via the annihilation operators $a(k)$, $a(k)|0>= 0$ for all k, because the field Hamiltonian turns out to be bounded from below (see formula (C.13) in Appendix C where toy models of scalar tachyon fields are considered), and of the construction of the invariant Fock space as usual:

$$|k_1, k_2, ..., k_i, ... >= a^+(k_1)a^+(k_2)...a^+(k_i)...|0> . \qquad (4.2)$$

Since now the Lorentz boosts do not mix creation and annihilation operators one is not forced to use anticommutator relations for scalar tachyon fields as it was necessary in Feinberg's theory. The commutation relations maximally close to the canonical ones may be used (see Appendix C), and this leads to other distinctions of our approach as

compared to Feinberg's theory: to a local Hamiltonian of the scalar tachyon field and to a possibility of use of the Lagrange formalism in a construction of the model lost in his theory.

When calculating the tachyon production probabilities and cross-sections the confining θ-functions will accompany the production amplitudes as factors restricting the reaction phase space, so the expressions for these probabilities can be displayed as follows:

$$W = \int |M|^2 d\tau \prod_i \theta(P_i U), \tag{4.3}$$

where M is a matrix element of the reaction (which has to be representable in a Lorentz-invariant form), $d\tau$ is a reaction phase space element, and the product of θ functions includes all the tachyons (having 4-momenta P_i) participating in the reaction.

For the first time this formula was suggested and exploited in a paper [28], which was dedicated to an experimental search for the tachyon preferred reference frame using the Earth motion [29] with respect to this frame[12].

4.2 Towards the unitarity of a tachyon theory

The replacement of the second postulate of special relativity, requiring the equivalence of the inertial frames, by a softer demand for physical processes to be described in a covariant manner cures many diseases of the Lorentz-invariant tachyon theory. In addition to the solution of the causality problem and the problem of the tachyon vacuum instability related to it, the introduction of the preferred reference frame into the physics of interacting tachyons removes difficulties related to the unitarity of such interactions.

In particular, the unitarity paradox was built in the reference [31]. Though it was related to a particular theory of tachyons [32, 33] it can be generalized to work against any theory of interacting tachyons unless the tachyon vacuum is fixed by the gauge (2.25) resulting in the appearance of restricting θ-terms in (4.3). With these terms the paradox will be destroyed since meson decay to itself and to a tachyon, considered in [31], will have zero probability if the meson is at rest in the preferred reference frame due to a corresponding term $\theta(PU)$ in (4.3) forbidding production of negative-energy tachyons in the preferred frame (similarly to a prohibition of an analogous decay with the tachyon replaced by an ordinary particle of negative energy, with the corresponding term $\theta(E)$ in the decay phase space). This will be true in any frame with the reaction kinematic parameters corresponding to the meson at rest in the preferred frame. On the other hand, in a frame moving with respect to the preferred one the process of such (spontaneous) decay can be allowed (if the meson appears in flight in the preferred frame), validating the formal calculations carried out in [31]. Some examples of processes of this type and comments on them are presented below, in Sect. 5.

In a similar way most of the arguments of paper [34] leading to a conclusion about inconsistency of any theory containing interacting tachyons with unitarity can be invalidated.

To generalize the application of the concept of the preferred reference frame to the unitarity problem consider, in this frame, a reaction with tachyons present in the initial

[12]Motivation for formula (4.3) based on the causality problem solution which led to this experiment was given in [30].

and/or final states. If one assigns to all initial state tachyons labels "cause", and to all final state tachyons labels "effect", this labelling can be easily traced to any reference frame due to its invariance ensured by causal terms in the product of formula (4.3), even though the tachyons of the initial state in the preferred frame might appear, in some other frame, as apparent antitachyons in the final state of the reaction due to the reinterpretation principle application, and vice versa. Then the tachyonic initial and final (asymptotically free) states will get the same status from the unitarity point of view as those of the ordinary particles. In other words, this means that the reaction asymptotic "in" and "out" Fock spaces are unitarily equivalent, even when they include tachyonic Fock spaces (4.2), just due to the invariant meaning of the tachyon creation operators $a^+(k)$.

Perhaps, the full content of this subsection may be expressed in a few words, namely: tachyon theories with the gauge (2.25) for the tachyon vacuum can be made unitary.

4.3 Tachyons within the Poincaré group approach

In spite of being very important for consistency of a tachyon theory the necessity of the preferred reference frame (needed to ensure the reasonable, i.e. causal, vacuum-stable, unitarity-consistent behaviour of faster-than-light particles) does not exclude the consideration of tachyons within the special relativity (i.e. the Poincaré group) approach. The causal restrictions on production and propagation of tachyons introduced in previous sections become experimentally essential for tachyons with velocities greater than c^2/u, where u is the velocity of the observer with respect to the preferred frame. For Earth-based laboratories the velocity $u \approx 370\ km/s$ [29], therefore such restrictions become important only for tachyons having velocities exceeding that of light by a factor of about 800 (note that such tachyons are rather elusive objects possessing very low energy losses and are difficult to handle experimentally). For relativistic tachyons (having velocities close to c) special relativity remains a very good approximation and their description by the Poincaré group UIR's is quite adequate.

Therefore it is instructive to consider tachyons as realizations of these representations.

4.3.1 Tachyons as realizations of the infinite-dimensional unitary irreducible representations of the Poincaré group (discrete series)

Several classes of UIR's of the little group $O(2,1)$ of the Poincaré group, describing imaginary rest mass particles, were considered by Wigner in [4]: two classes of infinite-dimensional UIR's (continuous and discrete classes) and a class of trivial representations corresponding to spinless (scalar) tachyons.

Many tachyon quantum field theories which exploited the latter class of the UIR's, leading to the Klein-Gordon equation with a negative mass term, can be found in the literature. However, from our point of view, the models of scalar tachyons have to be considered as toy models only. The argumentation for this is the following.

First, scalar tachyons interacting with ordinary particles would lead to an appearance of poles in the particle interaction amplitudes due to exchange by tachyons located on the mass shell as was indicated originally by [35] and then by [34].

Furthermore, the existence of scalar tachyons would result in the instability of photons, either via photon decay to a tachyon-antitachyon pair, or via such a decay accompanied

by a photon of a lower energy, i.e. via reactions:

$$\gamma \to t\bar{t} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\gamma \to \gamma' t\bar{t} \tag{4.5}$$

(one of these reactions has to be suppressed by the C-parity conservation, depending on the C-parity of the tachyon-antitachyon pair). Avoiding this photon instability leads to a conclusion about necessity of a very low coupling of scalar tachyons to ordinary particles, including photons, since apparently no other mechanisms exist to suppress these reactions in this case. Analogous conclusion can be drawn for the Cherenkov radiation by tachyons which is related to reaction (4.3) via crossing symmetry.

These are the reasons why we believe, together with [36] and contrary to the mainstream of the tachyon models suggested, that the most suitable representations to be related with tachyons are infinite-dimensional UIR's of the Poincaré group. Though as noticed in [36], a self-consistent and covariant field theory for these representations does not exist, besides the approaches proposed in [37, 38, 39, 40], the main characteristics of tachyons considered as realizations of these UIR's can be deduced from general properties of the little group $O(2,1)$ and its generators, briefly described in Appendix B.

First, all the states of these UIR's possess non-zero values of *helicities*, which can run up to infinity since the representations are infinite-dimensional. This can impose strong restrictions on the tachyon production amplitudes resulting from the angular momentum conservation, which can explain, at least partially, the failure of tachyon search experiments. Further, when choosing between continuous and discrete classes of the representations, the latter has an essential advantage since the two branches of this class have an attractive property which ensures the Lorentz-invariant separation of tachyon and antitachyon states. As noticed in [36], the Pauli-Lubanski vector (*the spin operator*) defined by

$$W^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} P_\nu M_{\rho\sigma}, \tag{4.6}$$

$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ being the fully antisymmetric tensor, is timelike for the discrete class and spacelike for the continuous one (the latter is true also for the Pauli-Lubanski vector in the case of ordinary, $P^2 > 0$, particles). This means that the time component of this vector does not change its sign under Lorentz transformations in the former case[13], and may change the sign under a suitable Lorentz transformation in the latter case. This property of the Pauli-Lubanski vector allows the invariant definition of tachyon and antitachyon states when choosing the discrete class for their description. This can be seen also from the fact that the representations of two discrete series, D_s^+ and D_s^-, are complex conjugate, thus corresponding to equal mass particles and antiparticles defined invariantly. In view of this invariance the reinterpretation principle suggested in [5] and aimed at the reinterpretation of negative energy tachyons as antitachyons moving in the opposite direction in space and time (Appendix A), appears to be restricted to the kinematic domain only (where it can be quite useful when doing a kinematic analysis). In other words, defined in such a manner particular numbers of faster-than-light particles and antiparticles participating in a given reaction remain Lorentz-invariant, independently on the fact that the signs of the time components of four-momenta of some tachyons and/or antitachyons, i.e. the

[13] With the specific vector P^0 defining the little group (see B.1), chosen to be $(0,0,0,\mu)$, this component equals to μM_{xy}.

signs of their energies, can be changed by Lorentz transformations. A direct consequence of this is the invariance of a global vacuum state defined as a state without localized quantum excitations, i.e. real particles (thus if some volume restricted by a spacelike surface does not contain real particles in some reference frame, there are no real particles in that volume in any other inertial frame) [14]. It is worth to note here that all these features, including the invariance of the global vacuum state, would be impossible (within the Lorentz approach) for scalar tachyons, which can be illustrated by considerations of particle aspects of scalar tachyon models suggested in Refs. [6, 32, 41, 42], according to which a zero- or single-tachyon state in one reference frame can be transformed by a Lorentz boost to the state with an infinite number of positive-energy tachyons in another frame, which immediately rises a question about conservation of unitarity in these models.

The invariance of the number of real tachyons under Lorentz transformations completes the labelling of tachyons as possessing positively-defined energy in the preferred reference frame, suggested before. Being defined in this frame as belonging to either D_s^+ or to D_s^- branch, tachyons and antitachyons obtain fixed labels which are independent on whether the signs of their energies change or not when passing to an arbitrary reference frame.

Our choice of $D_s^{\pm}$ representations means that tachyons should be described by infinite-component wave equations [37, 39]. This, in turn, leads to a consequence that tachyons must be produced in pairs with antitachyons only, in order to ensure that their production amplitudes would be scalar functions (expressed in a Lorentz-covariant form). Thus *the tachyon number*, postulated as a difference between numbers of tachyons and antitachyons, having essentially non-zero energies in the preferred reference frame, may be considered as a good, conserving quantum number, at least until cosmological effects are taken into account [15].

As to the problem of the tachyon vacuum stability which was studied with a toy model of scalar tachyons (Sect. 3.2) one may expect that the main result of this study presenting the ground state of the tachyon field as a superposition of zero-energy tachyons propagating isotropically will be conserved for tachyon fields of any tensor dimensionality since the equation (3.8), as well as the initial condition (3.6) leading to that particular solution, are expected to be valid for all individual tensor components of the fields. The only principal change which might appear due to replacement of a complex scalar field by an infinite-component one when constructing the tachyon vacuum wave function is a doubling of tachyon pairs in the coherent mechanism of the tachyon vacuum creation required by the angular momentum conservation (see e.g. Fig. 5b for explanation).

For the same reason the production of a real (non-vacuum) tachyon of a high helicity state back-to-back with an antitachyon (generally speaking, with essentially non-zero opening angle) is suppressed in any reaction, unless the antitachyon is produced in parallel with the tachyon, with the helicities of both particles compensating each other. The overall angular momentum of such a pair can be low (even zero), but the pair mass squared in this case cannot exceed $-4\mu^2$ restricting the production phase space. Taken together, these properties can lead to a significant suppression of the interactions of tachyons with ordinary particles, even if the tachyon coupling to them could be rather high, e.g. that of the electromagnetic interactions, α. In particular, one can expect a strong suppression of high-energy Cherenkov radiation from charged tachyons due to the angular momentum conservation. Furthermore, an additional suppression of tachyon production amplitudes

[14] Though it may sound paradoxically, but the invariance of the tachyon vacuum state is provided by the non-invariance of the tachyon vacuum borders.

may turn out to be surprisingly high as a consequence of a naturally appearing conjecture about longitudinal non-locality of tachyons considered in the next subsection[15].

4.3.2 Non-locality of tachyons

While eigenvalues of the generator M_{xy} are well-known quantum numbers called helicities, the physical meaning of the generators M_{xt} and M_{yt} presents a novel feature. In the language of Lorentz transformation in two transversal directions, they would leave invariant *a longitudinal tachyon size (i.e. the tachyon length)*, if we admit extended tachyons possessing such a property. The same is true for rotations in the xy plane. Thus this length will be an invariant of the $O(2,1)$ group, and we can indeed introduce a new quantum number, the tachyon intrinsic length. This is the way of how an idea of tachyons being explicitly non-local objects is emerging.

Let us call the tachyon intrinsic length by l_0. Since the l_0 cannot be an independent invariant of the $O(2,1)$ group, it has to be related to the Casimir invariant Q of the $D_s^{\pm}$ branches or, more appropriately, to the value s, the minimal absolute tachyon helicity. Let us consider, for example, a possible expression for the "visual appearance" of the tachyon length $l = s/(\chi E_t)$, where E_t is a tachyon energy and the dimensionless factor χ is introduced in order to account for our ignorance of tachyon characteristics. From a phenomenological consideration of the processes of tachyon-antitachyon pair production by high energy protons, given in the next Section, one can conclude that the parameter χ can be within the range of $10^{-1} - 10^{-3}$, i.e. it is not immensely low [16].

Thus the tachyon spatial extension has to be characterized by two parameters, by l_0 as an intrinsic length, and by ρ as a transversal size, as it should be for any axially-symmetric object. For the reasons mentioned above (smallness of χ) one has to assume that the tachyon length $l_0 >> r_\pi$, where r_π is a typical hadronic radius, 1.4 fm, while a vanishing size for the tachyon transverse dimension looks the most natural[17]. Then the resulting hierarchy of tachyon sizes displays tachyons as extended stringlike objects with the string extension, coupled to the tachyon helicity, being directed strictly along the tachyon momentum[18]. Let us note however, that the tachyonic "string" is, perhaps, a simpler object than the open (as well as closed) strings of the standard string theory,

[15]The term "longitudinal non-locality of tachyons" is introduced to distinguish it from the "spherical non-locality" of scalar tachyons noticed by G. Feinberg in [6].

[16]The range of possible values of χ includes the value of the electromagnetic coupling constant α. If this constant is indeed relevant to the problem under consideration, then the expression for the tachyon length can be written as

$$l = \frac{s}{\alpha E_t} = l_0\sqrt{v^2 - 1}, \tag{4.7}$$

where (recovering dimensionful units, but leaving s dimensionless)

$$l_0 = \left(\frac{\hbar}{e}\right)^2 \frac{s}{\mu} \tag{4.8}$$

is the tachyon intrinsic length.

[17]If the condition $\rho << l_0$ is adopted (including vanishing ρ), the size ρ has no influence on the experimental characteristics of a tachyon; for example, it can be neglected in calculations of the tachyon Cherenkov radiation rate.

[18]For the sake of completeness, we have to note that an axially-symmetric stringlike state with apparently superluminal group velocity can be obtained as a solution of a nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation [43]; however it is not related to UIR's of the Poincaré group.

in spite of the fact that both are non-local, one-dimensional objects. Since the tachyon extension is oriented strictly along its momentum, free motion of the tachyonic string can be described by a one-dimensional line in space (tending to a one-dimensional world line at $v \to c$), while free motions of the standard strings are described by two-dimensional world sheets.

To conclude the presentation of tachyons as realization of the infinite-dimensional UIR's of the Poincaré group, let us summarize briefly their properties deduced from the consideration of its little group $O(2,1)$, corresponding to the spacelike particles, restricting ourselves to the $D_s^{\pm}$ series. First of all, tachyons appear as extended (one-dimensional), axially-symmetric, stringlike objects. Their spins are directed along their momenta, to be more properly defined as helicities, always non-zero, as mentioned above. Ascribing to tachyons positive helicities, which may be either integer or half-odd-integer, the antitachyons will obtain negative ones. Tachyons can only be produced in pairs with antitachyons, conserving the tachyon number. A hint on the size of the tachyon longitudinal dimension can be obtained from a restriction on the energy loss experienced by high energy ordinary particles due to spontaneous emission of tachyon-antitachyon pairs imposed by observations (see next section).

5 Several notes concerning assumed tachyon interactions with ordinary particles

Unless a reasonable tachyon theory will be built one has to avoid the consideration of possible *dynamic* effects which can be induced by tachyons to interaction amplitudes of ordinary particles giving rise to deviation from the Standard Model, for example, via appearance of tachyon loops in Feynman diagrams. Hopefully, these deviations are expected to be non-violating the Lorentz invariance in the non-tachyon sectors of the theory, as noticed in Sect. 3.2. Moreover, they may be invoked for an explanation of some existing discrepancies between theoretical predictions and experimental results for highly accurate calculations and measurements of radiative correction effects, e.g. those in the muon anomalous magnetic moment [44].

However, there are effects in which *kinematic* tachyon effects should play a dominant role, while the dynamics of tachyon interactions with ordinary particles can be represented by simple assumptions. In particular, owing to the gauge for the tachyon vacuum (2.25) one can speculate that a theory of interacting tachyons promises to be rather similar, in principle, to that of ordinary particles, and tachyon interaction amplitudes can be constructed in a standard way applied to the construction of amplitudes of interactions between ordinary particles, of course, with the modifications necessary to account for the non-locality of tachyons. This conjecture will be used implicitly in all the considerations below concerning several effects of this type.

5.1 Spontaneous emission of a tachyon-antitachyon pair by a charged particle

An ordinary massive particle, being at rest in the preferred reference frame, cannot emit real tachyons since it is forbidden by the energy conservation law (let us not forget that in the preferred reference frame no negative-energy tachyons or antitachyons can exist).

However this process, i.e. an anomalous decay of a particle to itself with the emission of positive-energy tachyons, is kinematically allowed for particles moving with respect to the preferred reference frame [45, 46]. The only condition for a tachyon system to be emitted by such particles (the system must contain at least one tachyon-antitachyon pair since the production of a single tachyon pertaining to $D_s^{\pm}$ UIR's in any reaction with ordinary particles is forbidden) is the requirement for the spacelikeness of the system 4-momentum. Then a question may arise why the LHC works and why the high energy cosmic rays (HECR) exist?

Rejecting a straightforward solution of this problem by appealing to an extremely weak coupling of tachyons to ordinary particles, the reasonable answer to this question can be obtained only assuming an essential non-locality of the tachyon-antitachyon system, or more specifically, assuming a longitudinal extension of that system much bigger than the characteristic sizes of the ordinary particles. As has been shown above, this assumption can be easily accommodated with our consideration of tachyons as realizations of $D_s^{\pm}$ UIR's. Then the processes of the anomalous decays of particles with the emission of tachyons will be strongly suppressed due to a weak overlapping of the tachyon wave functions with those of the parent particles.

Let us consider, for example, the process of spontaneous emission of a tachyon-antitachyon pair by a proton possessing high energy in the preferred reference frame, i.e. the reaction

$$p_{in} \to p\ t^+t^- \tag{5.1}$$

and assuming tachyons to participate in standard electromagnetic interactions with ordinary particles, i.e. with an electromagnetic coupling constant α for such interactions.

First we have to design a mechanism for such a reaction since it has no analog in processes with ordinary particles[19].

Any asymptotic state (a proton in our case) is a wavepacket, i.e. a coherent superposition of plane waves with some weight function. Interactions destroy the coherence. So, an inelastic particle collision can be considered as a creation of a highly incoherent fireball from which free particles emerge after some formation time has passed, necessary for the coherence re-establishing. But what destroys the coherence of a proton, freely moving in vacuum, in the case of its anomalous decay to itself and to tachyons, i.e. in the reaction (5.1)?

The answer is obvious: vacuum tachyons. In the proton rest frame the proton "sees" a flux of vacuum tachyons and antitachyons possessing non-zero energies given, in particular, by formulae (3.12), (3.13) if they move along the direction of the preferred reference frame motion. They can interact with the proton at rest transferring to it some kinematically allowed portion of their 4-momenta. In the preferred reference frame this will be viewed as a spontaneous emission of tachyons by the proton with the slowing of the latter. In this frame the process can be described as an interaction of the moving proton with the vacuum tachyons promoting them to become real ones.

Within our hypothesis of the electromagnetic interactions of tachyons with ordinary particles the lowest order of the reaction (5.1) amplitude has to be of α^2 due to a need of the local charge and momentum conservation and can be presented by a Feynman diagram

[19]There is one exclusion concerning the photon decay to an odd number of lower energy photons, all the photons moving in the same direction (the reaction respects both, the Farry theorem and the energy-momentum conservation law, but has zero phase space volume).

displayed in Fig. 5a (as well as by an analogous diagram with the virtual photons q_1, q_2 interchanged, and may be by some other diagrams of the same order in α, with photon lines between tachyons which would involve an additional non-local tachyon form-factor, similar to those indicated in Fig. 5).




Fig. 5. a) 2nd order Feynman diagram of tachyon pair production. b) 4th order Feynman diagram of two tachyon pair production. Open ellipses at tachyon-photon vertices symbolize non-local tachyon form-factors. Vertical dashed lines symbolize the tachyon vacuum.

Moreover, the lowest order amplitude of interaction of a proton with vacuum tachyons may turn out to be of α^4 as demonstrates the diagram in Fig. 5b, since the diagram 5a violates the law of the angular momentum conservation if the minimal tachyon helicity is greater than 1/2. But for the moment we shall restrict our consideration to the case of α^2 interaction, i.e. of α^4 in terms of probability.

Each of the two tachyon-proton interaction sub-diagrams in Fig. 5a has to contain a non-local tachyon form-factor, i.e. it will be proportional to a non-local term having (in the preferred reference frame) a form $\int d^3\mathbf{x}[\bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x})Q\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{x})\xi(\mathbf{x})]$, where $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ and $\xi(\mathbf{x})$ are the proton and tachyon wave functions and Q is some matrix relating to the indices of the particle wave function components (hidden in the expression). The probability of the process will be given by a formula of a standard type:

$$W = \frac{(2\pi)^4}{2E_{in}} \int |M|^2 \, d\tau, \tag{5.2}$$

where E_{in} is the initial energy of the proton in the preferred reference frame, M is a matrix element of reaction (5.1), and $d\tau$ is a phase space element. (Over)simplifying the situation, we present the $|M|^2$ by a constant term

$$|M|^2 = \alpha^4 \left(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0}\right)^4 \tag{5.3}$$

(most probably, the energy and angular dependences of the matrix element will decrease

the probability). The constant suppression factor

$$\delta \sim \left(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0}\right)^4, \tag{5.4}$$

comes from the weak overlap of the wave functions of the interacting particles in reaction (5.1): since the proton wave function differs from zero only in the region of dimension r_π each (incoming and outgoing) tachyon brings a factor of $\sqrt{r_\pi/l_0}$ to the amplitude. Then, on the base of calculations presented in Appendix D, we obtain an approximate formula for energy loss by a high energy proton due to its anomalous decay to itself and to a tachyon-antitachyon pair:

$$\frac{dE}{dx} = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3}\ \alpha^4\ \left(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0}\right)^4\ \frac{\mu^4}{E_{in}^2} \ln\frac{E_{in}}{\mu} \tag{5.5}$$

(an ultra-relativistic case is assumed here, $E_{in} >> m_p, E_{in} >> \mu$, and $\mu \geq m_p$; a little bit more accurate formula for dE/dx is given in Appendix D).

For our estimations we suggest $\mu = m_p$ and $r_\pi/l_0 = 10^{-3}$. With a calculated value of $dE/dx = 3\times10^{-17}$ GeV/cm this results in 0.1 eV of the mean energy loss by a 7 TeV LHC proton per each turn in the LHC ring which is negligible as compared to other energy losses (e.g. due to synchrotron radiation a 7 TeV LHC proton looses ≈ 6.7 keV per turn [47]).

Neglecting a logarithmic dependence on E_{in} in (5.5) one can estimate a HECR proton path until it looses a half of its initial energy:

$$\Delta x_{\frac{1}{2}} \approx 0.3 E_{in} \Big/ \frac{dE}{dx}. \tag{5.6}$$

Using (5.6) we have obtained an estimation for a proton path, of a proton of the primary HECR with the energy, say, 10^{15} eV, equal to 30 Mpc, which corresponds to a typical scale of the propagation length of the highest energy cosmic rays.

One can interpret the processes of type (5.1) of the energy loss by particles moving with respect to the preferred reference frame due to a spontaneous emission of tachyons as a specific "bremsstrahlung" experienced by charged particles moving through the tachyonic vacuum presenting some kind of a medium, a tachyonic "ether" as it has been called in the Introduction. Having an accurate theory of tachyon interactions and the parameter l_0 evaluated with a smaller uncertainty, it would be interesting to calculate the influence of this "bremsstrahlung" on peculiar velocities of galaxies and to compare the distribution of these velocities obtained with the nearest galaxies to that of the high redshift ones if the calculated difference in the distributions induced by this "bremsstrahlung", in addition to the standard cosmological deceleration (2.1), would be measurable by modern astronomical tools.

5.2 Production of tachyons in collisions of ordinary particles

Unlike the anomalous *decays* of the ordinary particles with tachyon emission, the suppression of the tachyon production in processes of *collisions* of ordinary particles is expected to be much weaker since no vacuum tachyons are necessary anymore to participate in the production of real tachyons. They can emerge from the fireball created by colliding

projectiles like the ordinary particles, so the lowest order amplitude of the tachyon pair production via electromagnetic interactions can be of α, and the production cross section matrix element squared, in the constant term approximation, will be given by

$$|M|^2 = \alpha^2 \left(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0}\right)^2, \tag{5.7}$$

thus the suppression factor for the tachyon pair production being of the order of

$$\delta \sim \left(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0}\right)^2. \tag{5.8}$$

5.3 Tachyons and atomic physics

A big longitudinal tachyonic size can be invoked also when addressing the questions coming from the atomic physics, at the opposite side of the microworld energy range. Why various atomic physics effects such as the fine structure of the atomic spectra, Lamb shift, and others are not influenced by tachyons having characteristic sizes l_0 of the order of 10^{-10} cm or so? The answer lies just in the atomic energy scale, which is concentrated mainly within the range from 1 to 20 eV. If mass parameters of tachyons exceed 100 MeV, the tachyon longitudinal sizes at these energies will be stretched by $\sqrt{v^2-1}$ coefficients exceeding 5×10^6, and the suppression factors attenuating any Lorentz-non-invariant influence of vacuum tachyons on the atomic physics effects are expected to be at the level of 10^{-19} or less; even in the case of the tachyonic masses of the order of the electron one (i.e. about 1 MeV) the Lorentz-non-invariant effects induced by tachyons may be suppressed by factors of the order of 10^{-11} or less.

However when an accurate tachyon theory will be available and the parameter l_0 will be evaluated more accurately, it would be worth to consider the possibility of an experiment aimed at looking for possible decoherence effects induced by the tachyonic "ether" resembling the famous Michelson experiment, but using an atom wave interferometer instead of the optical one and assuming the velocity of the motion with respect to the ether to be 10^{-3} c, instead of 30 km/s of the Earth orbital motion in the original Michelson experiment.

6 Experimental status of the tachyon hypothesis

Due to the strong theoretical objection to faster-than-light particles that they apparently violate causality, depicted in Sect. 2, few experiments have been made to search for them. From several experiments carried out between the 1970 and 1987 with low energy hadronic beams [48, 49, 50], which used rather realistic assumptions about tachyon behaviour in particle detectors, one can conclude that tachyons do not participate in strong interactions, unless some specific mechanism exists, suppressing the cross sections (probabilities in [48]) of their production in hadronic reactions by 3-4 orders of magnitude.

Several experiments looking for charged tachyon production in electromagnetic interactions using radioactive sources have also been made [51, 52, 28]. However, restrictive upper limits on the tachyon production that were concluded from these experiments were obtained under strong assumptions about tachyon behaviour in the respective experimental set-ups, and therefore, in our view, are questionable.

Currently the data collected by the Collaboration DELPHI at the CERN e^+e^- collider LEP are analysed with the aim to look for tachyons possessing electromagnetic interactions. The analysis is based on the tachyon properties deduced from the considerations presented in this note.

7 Concluding remarks on a general approach to the tachyon problems

Many serious problems of any Lorentz-invariant tachyon theory, mentioned in the Introduction, originate from the fact that the tachyon mass hyperboloid is one-sheeted, and therefore positive-energy tachyons on mass shell can be converted to the negative-energy tachyons by a proper Lorentz transformation. Unfortunately, ingenious suggestion of the principle reinterpretation [5] which replaces negative-energy tachyons by positive-energy antitachyons does not solve the problems. They can be solved only by a replacement of the second postulate of special relativity about equivalence of all inertial frames by a softer demand to a theory to be expressed in a covariant form in any such frame, even though one of them is the preferred frame. Then the *Lorentz-covariant cut* of the tachyon mass hyperboloid (namely, the gauge (2.25)) separates *invariantly* tachyons from antitachyons allowing *Lorentz-covariant calculations of the particle interaction probabilities* which are the main quantitative theoretical outcome in particle physics.

One can ask why the principle of relativity works perfectly in the case of ordinary particles, but has to be replaced by a softer requirement of the physical law covariance when dealing with tachyons. The reason for this is a difference in the properties of the corresponding vacua. The vacuum of ordinary particles is an essentially quantum-mechanical object and reveals itself locally in the world of elementary particles, in the sense that it "works" in the closest vicinity of a particle, whatever results of this "work" are: Unruh-Davies effect, Lamb shift or a need for the renormalisation of a theory. Even in the case of its influence as a global entity, as in the example of the electromagnetic vacuum in the Casimir effect, its properties are insensitive to the global features of the macroworld (i.e. our universe). On the contrary, the tachyon vacuum, obtained under a demand of its stability and consisting of on-mass-shell, infinite speed tachyons, can be treated even classically, and appears to be very sensitive to those features which require to be accounted for in this case, leading to a loss of the relativity principle, i.e. to the appearance of the preferred reference frame.

This and other modifications of certain quantum aspects of the tachyon theory (e.g. tachyon non-locality combined with the representation of the tachyon field operators by solutions of infinite-component wave equations) make it more difficult for a technical treatment as compared to the theory of ordinary particles. It is natural and perhaps inevitable: would tachyons be realizations of the simplest, spin-zero UIR's of the Poincaré group, they would be easily "reachable" experimentally though much more controversial from the theoretical point of view.

Currently neither theory nor experiment demand the existence of the faster-than-light particles, and only few experimental facts exist, lying outside of the Standard Model, which probably can be attributed to tachyons. However for the reasons which look obvious (note for example a tremendous interest of the physical and public communities to the OPERA results [53] though from the very beginning they looked to be incompatible with

the tachyon hypothesis) the investigation of the possibility of particles existing beyond the light barrier is a must of the scientific research. If they do not exist we have to understand why. The former arguments against such particles can be circumvented in a way shown above and, thus, turn out to be invalid. On the other hand, an observation of particles moving with superluminal velocities would mean a discovery of a new world of the nature constituents; leaving aside a possible practical use of such a discovery, one can notice that it would allow the establishment of a new role of the invariant speed of light as an universal, non-penetrable speed barrier between the two particle worlds.

E.C.G. Sudarshan stated in [32] that no reason really exists for not investigating the possible existence of faster-than-light particles experimentally, which was mainly ignored by experimenters. However, after several decades have passed, this remains a true appeal.

8 Summary

The main ideas suggested in this note for a consistent tachyon theory can be listed as follows:

i) A postulate of the preferred reference frame is mandatory in any tachyon theory in order to ensure the causality conservation.

ii) The tachyon vacuum seen in the preferred reference frame is a sea of zero-energy, on-mass-shell tachyons moving isotropically; this vacuum is stable. There is a rotational asymmetry of the tachyon vacuum in non-preferred frames ensuring the causality conservation.

iii) Scalar tachyons can be neutral only (generally speaking, with very weak coupling to ordinary particles).

iv) If tachyons are realizations of infinite-dimensional UIR's of the Poincaré group[20] (infinite-spin tachyons) they have to be produced in pairs with antitachyons.

v) Infinite spin tachyons must be axially symmetric objects which logically leads to the conjecture about the existence of an intrinsic longitudinal size of the tachyons. Thus the tachyon theory has to be a non-local one. The extended tachyons can be electrically charged; in the case of "normal" electromagnetic interactions of tachyons with ordinary particles estimations for the tachyon (longitudinal) sizes can be obtained requiring an agreement with observational facts, to be at the level of $10^{-10} - 10^{-12}$ cm.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Profs. K. G. Boreskov, F. S. Dzheparov, A. A. Grigoryan, O. V. Kancheli and S. M. Sibiryakov for fruitful discussions, and to Dr. B. French for the critical reading of the manuscript.

[20] or its extension.

Appendix A. Tachyon kinematics

Faster-than-light particles were postulated in [5] possessing the following properties. They cannot traverse the light barrier and be brought to rest in any reference frame. Therefore their rest mass is imaginary, $m = i\mu$, mass squared is negative, $m^2 = -\mu^2$, which determines their four-momentum, $P = (E, \mathbf{p})$ to be spacelike. Thus $E^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 = -\mu^2$. Defining the particle velocity by $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{p}/\mathrm{E}$ the formulae for its energy and momentum become:

$$E = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{v^2 - 1}} \tag{A.1}$$

$$\mathbf{p} = \frac{\mu \mathbf{v}}{\sqrt{v^2 - 1}} \tag{A.2}$$

Thus, the energy and momentum of the faster-than-light particle are always real. As v approaches 1 both the energy and momentum unlimitedly grow. Contrary, with the velocity increase they decrease, the energy approaching zero at v approaching infinity, and the momentum tending to the finite value μ (this is the tachyon state used when constructing the tachyon vacuum, see Sect. 3.2). The sign of the energy can be changed by a suitable Lorentz transformation,

$$E' = \frac{E - \mathbf{pu}}{\sqrt{1 - u^2}} = \frac{E(1 - \mathbf{vu})}{\sqrt{1 - u^2}}, \tag{A.3}$$

if $\mathbf{vu} > 1$, where $\mathbf{u}$ is the relative velocity of two reference frames. Simultaneously the sign of the time component of an interval connecting given points on the tachyon world line is changed. A coherent explanation of these changes was suggested in [5], denoted as *the principle of reinterpretation*. Accordingly to this principle, a faster-than-light particle of negative energy moving backward in time should be interpreted as an antiparticle of positive energy moving forward in time and in the opposite spatial direction. This reinterpretation is analogous to that proposed by Dirac, Stückelberg, Wheeler and Feynman for negative energy electrons going backward in time to be interpreted as positive energy positrons going forward in time [54, 55, 56].

Appendix B. Unitary irreducible representations of the Poincaré group for spacelike momenta

In Wigner's paper [4] several classes of UIR's of the Poincaré group were considered, the UIR's corresponding to particles with spacelike momenta, $P^2 < 0$, among them. To classify the UIR's Wigner defined so called "little group", selecting from all possible momentum vectors a definite one denoted by P^0. Then he defines the little group as the group of all Lorentz transformations L which leave P^0 invariant,

$$LP^0 = P^0. \tag{B.1}$$

In the case of $P^2 < 0$, the P^0 is taken to be parallel to the z axis with the transformations L which leave invariant the form $t^2 - x^2 - y^2$ (or, equivalently, the form $E^2 - p_x^2 - p_y^2$).

The corresponding little group is a non-compact group of rotations in 2+1 dimensions, which is called $O(2,1)$ [21].

The Lie algebra of $O(2,1)$ contains three independent elements, a compact generator M_{xy}, and two non-compact generators M_{xt} and M_{yt}. M_{xy} generates spatial rotations around the z axis, i.e. in a plane perpendicular to the tachyon momentum (it is called the *helicity* generator), while M_{xt} and M_{yt} are the generators of boosts in two independent directions in this plane. The generators obey the following commutation relations:

$$[M_{xy}, M_{xt}] = \quad iM_{yt}, \tag{B.2}$$

$$[M_{xy}, M_{yt}] = -iM_{xt}, \tag{B.3}$$

$$[M_{xt}, M_{yt}] = -iM_{xy}. \tag{B.4}$$

Eigenvalues of M_{xy} are either integers or half-odd integers with the corresponding UIR's being either single or double-valued, respectively. Within a given representation the eigenvalues differ from one another by integers.

The Casimir invariant of the little group (which is, up to a factor of $1/\mu^2$, the "internal" Casimir invariant of the Poincaré group) is defined by

$$Q = M_{xt}^2 + M_{yt}^2 - M_{xy}^2. \tag{B.5}$$

Solving commutation relations (B.2) - (B.4) the following classes of UIR's were found, characterized by the value of the Casimir invariant Q and by the set of eigenvalues of the generator M_{xy} (by *the helicity spectrum*):

a). Continuous class, integral case: $h = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2,\ ..., ad\ inf.,\ 0 < Q < \infty$.

b). Continuous class, half-integral case: $h = \pm 1/2, \pm 3/2,\ ..., ad\ inf.,\ 1/4 < Q < \infty$.

c). Discrete class; it contains two branches: one, denoted by D_s^+, has positive helicities, $h_t = s, s+1, s+2,\ ..., ad\ inf.$, so s is the lowest eigenvalue of M_{xy}, s can assume the values $1/2, 1, 3/2, 2,\ ..., ad\ inf.$, and another, denoted by D_s^-, with the same but negative helicities, so $-s$ is the highest eigenvalue of M_{xy}; the representations of this branch are conjugate complex to the representations of D_s^+. $Q = -s(s-1)$ for the both branches.

d). There is also a trivial solution of the commutation relations, $M_{xy} = M_{xt} = M_{yt} = 0$ resulting in trivial representations in which every group element is represented by the unit operator. These representations correspond to spinless (scalar) tachyons.

Appendix C. Quantization of a scalar tachyon field

Consider, as a toy model, a free real scalar tachyon field

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int d^4k \, \left[a(k) \exp(-ikx) + a^+(k) \exp(ikx) \right] \, \delta(k^2 + \mu^2) \, \theta(kU), \tag{C.1}$$

[21] To display a distinction with the case of $P^2 > 0$ we note that in that case the vector P^0 is taken along the time axis and the resulting little group is a compact group $O(3)$ whose UIR's, such as d-functions of the angular momentum theory, are well known.

where k is a tachyon 4-momentum, $k = (\omega, \mathbf{k})$, $a(k), a^+(k)$ are annihilation and creation operators, and U is the 4-velocity of the preferred reference frame with respect to the observer. The presence of the delta function $\delta(k^2 + \mu^2)$ in (C.1) is compulsory since we are considering free fields corresponding to mass shell particles; note, without it the theta function $\theta(kU)$ is ill-defined.

Application of $\delta(k^2 + \mu^2)$ assumes, as usual, two roots of the equation $k^2 + \mu^2 = 0$:

$$\omega = +\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 - \mu^2} \tag{C.2}$$

and

$$\omega = -\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 - \mu^2}, \tag{C.3}$$

both with $|\mathbf{k}| \geq \mu$, but in the preferred reference frame the root (C.3) is killed by the term $\theta(kU)$. In a moving frame the yields of (C.2), (C.3) are restricted by the same term to regions $\omega \geq \mathbf{ku}$. Therefore integrating (C.1) over k^0 gives, after expressing canonical annihilation and creation operators $a_\mathbf{k}, a^+_\mathbf{k}$, annihilating or creating tachyonic states with 3-momentum $\mathbf{k}$, via $a(k), a^+(k)$

$$a_\mathbf{k} = a(k)\ \theta(kU)/\sqrt{2(kU)}, \tag{C.4}$$

$$a^+_\mathbf{k} = a^+(k)\ \theta(kU)/\sqrt{2(kU)}, \tag{C.5}$$

with the factors included to ensure a proper covariant normalisation of a single-tachyon wave function,

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{2\omega} \sqrt{\frac{2(\omega - \mathbf{ku})}{(2\pi)^3\sqrt{1-u^2}}} \left[a_\mathbf{k} \exp(-i\omega t + i\mathbf{kx}) + a^+_\mathbf{k} \exp(i\omega t - i\mathbf{kx})\right]. \tag{C.6}$$

In the preferred reference frame

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>0} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{\sqrt{2\omega}} \left[a_\mathbf{k} \exp(-i\omega t + i\mathbf{kx}) + a^+_\mathbf{k} \exp(i\omega t - i\mathbf{kx})\right]. \tag{C.7}$$

Let us make here a remark about the minimal value of the energy of an individual tachyonic mode (in the preferred reference frame), $\omega_{min} \to 0$. The "zero-energy" state of a real tachyon has to be regarded as a state of very small but finite energy thus separating real tachyon states from the vacuum ones. This small (minimally detectable) energy is determined by the uncertainty principle, $\omega_{min}\Delta t \geq 1$, with $\Delta t = \Delta x/v$ where Δx is the size of the experimental setup subdetector in which the tachyon energy can be measured, and v is a tachyon velocity, i.e. $\Delta t = \Delta x\ \omega_{min}/|\mathbf{k}|_{min} \approx \Delta x\ \omega_{min}/\mu$ from which $\omega_{min} \geq \sqrt{\mu/\Delta x}$ (a similar estimation for ω_{min} can be obtained from the uncertainty relation connecting Δx with the tachyon momentum uncertainty at $|\mathbf{k}| \to \mu$) [22]. This explains why equality signs are omitted in the integration limits in (C.6), (C.7) and in analogous limits below.

[22] A typical value of Δx of modern experimental installations can be estimated to be of order of $1m$ (if tachyons participate in the electromagnetic interactions with the standard coupling α). Then taking $\mu \approx 1$ GeV one obtains $\omega_{min} \geq 14$ eV.

Requiring the field (C.1) to obey the translational invariance the following equation should hold:

$$[P_\mu, \Phi(x)] = -i\partial_\mu \Phi(x), \tag{C.8}$$

where P_μ is an operator of a 4-momentum of the field. Its solution for P_μ is:

$$P_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^3}\; k_\mu\; [a^+(k)a(k) + a(k)a^+(k)]\; \delta(k^2+\mu^2)\; \theta(kU) \tag{C.9}$$

when choosing the bosonic commutation relations for a, a^+ operators:

$$[a(k), a(k')] = 0, \quad [a^+(k), a^+(k')] = 0. \tag{C.10}$$

$$[a(k), a^+(k')]\; \delta(k^2+\mu^2)\; \delta(k'^2+\mu^2)\; \theta(kU)\; \theta(k'U) = \delta^4(k-k')\; \delta(k^2+\mu^2)\; \theta(kU). \tag{C.11}$$

In particular, the field Hamiltonian is

$$H \equiv P^0 = \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^3}\; k^0\; [a^+(k)a(k) + a(k)a^+(k)]\; \delta(k^2+\mu^2)\; \theta(kU), \tag{C.12}$$

which, after dropping as usually the infinite c-number related to zero-point oscillations, results in

$$H = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\omega - \mathbf{ku}}{\sqrt{1-u^2}}\; a^+_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}} \tag{C.13}$$

which has non-negative eigenvalues. Thus the Hamiltonian is bounded from below and is Hermitian. This is in an agreement with the statement formulated at the end of Sect. 4.2 that a tachyon theory with the gauge (2.25) for the tachyon vacuum can be made unitary, just due to a corresponding property of the evolution operator $\exp(-iHt)$.

In the preferred reference frame

$$H = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>0} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\; \omega\; a^+_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}} \tag{C.14}$$

resembling, in accordance with the correspondence principle formulated at the end of Sect. 2, the standard expression for ordinary scalar particles.

Let us express the Hamiltonian in terms of the field Φ. First, using (C.6) we write $a(\mathbf{k}), a^+(\mathbf{k})$ in terms of $\Phi, \dot\Phi$. On the spacelike hypersurface $t = t_0$ they are:

$$a_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{\omega(1-u^2)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{2(\omega - \mathbf{ku})}}\; \exp(i\omega t_0) \int d^3\mathbf{x}\; \exp(-i\mathbf{kx})\; \left[\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{x}) + \frac{i\dot\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{x})}{\omega}\right], \tag{C.15}$$

$$a^+_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{\omega(1-u^2)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{2(\omega - \mathbf{ku})}}\; \exp(-i\omega t_0) \int d^3\mathbf{x}\; \exp(i\mathbf{kx})\; \left[\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{x}) - \frac{i\dot\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{x})}{\omega}\right]. \tag{C.16}$$

Inserting (C.15), (C.16) into (C.13) we get

$$H = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}\;\omega^2}{2(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{x} d^3\mathbf{y} \left[\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{x}) - \frac{i\dot\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{x})}{\omega}\right]\left[\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{y}) + \frac{i\dot\Phi(t_0,\mathbf{y})}{\omega}\right] \exp[-i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})] \tag{C.17}$$

Noting that $\int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} d^3\mathbf{k}\; \exp[-i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})] = (2\pi)^3 \bar\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})$ and
$\int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} d^3\mathbf{k}\; \omega^2 \exp[-i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})] = (2\pi)^3[-(\partial/\partial x_i)^2 - \mu^2]\; \bar\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})$, where $\bar\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})$ is

a "truncated" delta function which acts like the standard delta function with respect to those functions whose Fourier transforms vanish at $|\mathbf{k}| < \mu,\ \omega < (\mathbf{ku})$, we obtain finally the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big[\dot{\Phi}^2(x) + \nabla\Phi(x)\nabla\Phi(x) - \mu^2\Phi^2(x)\Big] \tag{C.18}$$

which is local, as distinct to that of the Feinberg's model, and corresponds to a local Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big[\dot{\Phi}^2(x) - \nabla\Phi(x)\nabla\Phi(x) + \mu^2\Phi^2(x)\Big] \tag{C.19}$$

allowing a standard Lagrangian formalism of the field description to be used.

Let us compare the Lagrangian (C.19) with that in the expression (3.14) (ignoring for the moment the distinction between real and complex fields in these expressions). They differ by a Lorentz-non-invariant term presented in the latter. This term has been introduced to (3.14) to describe the deviation of the theory in the tachyon sector from the Lorentz invariance motivated by the requirement of the causality conservation, while the starting point of the approach developed in Sect. 3.2 was a Lorentz-invariant Lagrangian (3.1). Contrary, in this Appendix we started with an explicitly Lorentz-non-invariant tachyon field operator and arrived at an apparently Lorentz-invariant Lagrangian. Why did such metamorphoses happen?

The reason is the fact that, in analogy with the argumentation for introducing the Lorentz-non-invariant term to (3.14), in the case of the real scalar field under consideration we can add to the Lagrangian a similar term $\lambda U^\mu\partial_\mu\Phi(x)$. Because this additional term, written down as $\lambda\partial_\mu F^\mu(x)$, where $F^\mu(x) \equiv U^\mu\Phi(x)$, is proportional to the total divergence of the 4-vector $F^\mu(x)$, the both Lagrangians, with and without the additional term, are physically equivalent since the term with $\partial_\mu F^\mu(x)$ does not contribute to physical quantities excepting those related to the tachyon vacuum.

Furthermore, this additional term, as well as the Lorentz-non-invariant term in (3.14), does not change the tachyon equation of motion (3.8). Therefore within our approach the Lorentz-invariance can be defined as spontaneously broken and its violation appears to be restricted to the asymptotic-tachyon-states sector only, even in the case of presumed tachyon interactions with ordinary particles. Considering a tachyon propagator as an inverse of the wave equation (3.8) in momentum space, we can write down, for example, the Feynman propagator as

$$\tilde{G}_F(k) = \frac{i}{k^2 + \mu^2 + i\epsilon} \tag{C.20}$$

to be used in Feynman diagrams describing tachyon interactions, of course, only within our toy model of scalar tachyons. In the configuration space

$$G_F(x-y) = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|\geq\mu}\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\ \frac{i\ \exp\left[-ik(x-y)\right]}{k^2 + \mu^2 + i\epsilon}. \tag{C.21}$$

The standard $i\epsilon$ prescription makes the tachyon Feynman propagator Lorentz invariant likewise the Feynman propagators of ordinary particles. Contrary, the retarded and advanced tachyon Green functions of classical tachyon field theory are not invariant and can be transformed one to another in a specific kinematic domain by a suitable Lorentz transformation. which agrees well with the Bilaniuk-Desphande-Sudarshan reinterpretation principle [5].

An important item are commutation relations for the tachyon field operators $\Phi, \dot{\Phi}$. The commutation relations (C.10), (C.11) for the operators a, a^+ lead to the commutation relation for the tachyon fields:

$$[\Phi(x), \Phi(y)] = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{\exp[-ik(x-y)] - \exp[(ik(x-y)]\right\} \delta(k^2+\mu^2)\ \theta(kU) \quad \text{(C.22)}$$

which is not automatically zero at $(x-y)^2 < 0$ as distinct to the field commutators of ordinary particles. Consider it in the preferred reference frame:

$$[\Phi(x), \Phi(y)] = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>0} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{2\omega} \left\{\exp\left[-i\omega\Delta t + i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\right] - \exp\left[i\omega\Delta t - i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\right]\right\}, \quad \text{(C.23)}$$

where $\Delta t = x^0 - y^0$. If $\Delta t \neq 0$ the commutator does not vanish; moreover, with this condition in the preferred reference frame it does not vanish in any other frame since the expression (C.22) is Lorentz-covariant.

On the other hand, if $\Delta t = 0$ in the preferred reference frame the commutator (C.23) vanishes:

$$[\Phi(x), \Phi(y)]_{x^0=y^0} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{|\mathbf{k}|\geq\mu, \omega\geq 0} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{2\omega} \left\{\exp i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) - \exp -i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\right\} = 0 \quad \text{(C.24)}$$

which is a nice feature corresponding to the impossibility of superluminal communications with the infinite speed of the signal ($\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})/\Delta t = \infty$ in this case), i.e. via exchange by zero-energy (vacuum) tachyons which is intuitively obvious. Note that both Feinberg [6] and Arons-Sudarshan [32] models do not possess this property: in their models the field equal-time (anti)commutators do not vanish:

$$\{\Phi(x), \Phi(y)\}_{x^0=y^0} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{\omega}\ \exp i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}), \quad \text{(C.25)}$$

see formula (4.14) (for a real field) in [6], and

$$[\Phi(x), \Phi^+(x')]_{x^0=x^{0\prime}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{\omega}\ \exp i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'), \quad \text{(C.26)}$$

formula (3.8) (for a complex field) in [32].

A similar complaint can be addressed to Feinberg's $\{\dot{\Phi}(x), \dot{\Phi}(y)\}_{x^0=y^0}$, non-equal to zero, see expression (4.17) in [6]. In our model

$$[\dot{\Phi}(x), \dot{\Phi}(y)]_{x^0=y^0} = 0, \quad \text{(C.27)}$$

while the equal-time commutator of the field Φ with its canonical conjugate $\dot{\Phi}$ does not vanish corresponding to the analogous commutator for the ordinary particle fields:

$$[\Phi(x), \dot{\Phi}(y)]_{x^0=y^0} = i\ \bar{\delta}^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}). \quad \text{(C.28)}$$

Such are the main features of a free scalar real field of faster-than-light particles in our model (one can note that it shares several common properties with the model [33], c.f. commutator relations (C.24), (C.28) here and those (1.10) in [33]).

The generalization of the method to a complex scalar field is straightforward:

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int d^4k \, \left[a(k)\exp(-ikx) + b^+(k)\exp(ikx)\right] \, \delta(k^2+\mu^2) \, \theta(kU), \qquad \text{(C.29)}$$

$$\Phi^+(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int d^4k \, \left[a^+(k)\exp(ikx) + b(k)\exp(-ikx)\right] \, \delta(k^2+\mu^2) \, \theta(kU) \qquad \text{(C.30)}$$

with the commutation relations for a, a^+ and b, b^+ being similar to (C.10), C(11).

The field commutator

$$[\Phi(x), \Phi^+(y)] = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^3} \, \left\{\exp[-ik(x-y)] - \exp[(ik(x-y)]\right\} \, \delta(k^2+\mu^2) \, \theta(kU) \qquad \text{(C.31)}$$

reproduces (C.22) with all its properties. Similarly, the Hamiltonian and Lagrangian of the field are given, up to a factor of $1/2$, by expressions (C.18) and (C.19), with the bilinear forms in Φ being replaced by those in Φ, Φ^+. There exists, as expected, a charge-current 4-vector

$$j^\mu = i(\Phi^+ \partial^\mu \Phi - \partial^\mu \Phi^+ \Phi) \qquad \text{(C.32)}$$

which satisfies the usual continuity equation. The total charge of the field is

$$Q \equiv \int d^3\mathbf{x} \; j^0(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\omega - \mathbf{ku}}{\omega\sqrt{1-u^2}} \, \left[a^+_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}} - b_{\mathbf{k}} b^+_{\mathbf{k}}\right] \qquad \text{(C.33)}$$

which is an explicitly Lorentz-covariant value. Defining the numbers of tachyons and antitachyons by

$$N_t = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \; \frac{\omega - \mathbf{ku}}{\omega\sqrt{1-u^2}} \; a^+_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}}, \qquad \text{(C.34)}$$

$$N_{\bar{t}} = \int_{|\mathbf{k}|>\mu, \omega>\mathbf{ku}} \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \; \frac{\omega - \mathbf{ku}}{\omega\sqrt{1-u^2}} \; b^+_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}} \qquad \text{(C.35)}$$

we obtain, up to a standard infinite additive constant,

$$Q = N_t - N_{\bar{t}} \; . \qquad \text{(C.36)}$$

Appendix D. Estimation of energy loss by high energy protons via emission of tachyon-antitachyon pairs

Representing the matrix element squared of the reaction (5.1) probability by a constant term $\alpha^4(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0})^4$ the proton energy loss can be approximated by

$$\frac{dE}{dx} = \frac{(2\pi)^4}{2E_{in}} \, \alpha^4 \Big(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0}\Big)^4 \int (E_{in} - E) \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{2E(2\pi)^3} \; \frac{d^3\mathbf{k_1}}{2\omega_1(2\pi)^3} \; \frac{d^3\mathbf{k_2}}{2\omega_2(2\pi)^3} \; \delta^4(p_{in} - p - k_1 - k_2) \qquad \text{(D.1)}$$

where 4-momenta of the initial and final protons are $p_{in} = (E_{in}, \mathbf{p}_{in}), \; p = (E, \mathbf{p})$, and 4-momenta of tachyons are $k_1 = (\omega_1, \mathbf{k}_1), \; k_2 = (\omega_2, \mathbf{k}_2)$. After some algebra

$$\frac{dE}{dx} = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3} \; \alpha^4 \; \Big(\frac{r_\pi}{l_0}\Big)^4 \; \frac{\mu^4}{E_{in}|\mathbf{p}_{in}|} \ln \frac{E_{in} - E_{min} + \sqrt{(E_{in} - E_{min})^2 + 4\mu^2}}{2\mu}, \qquad \text{(D.2)}$$

where

$$E_{min} = E_{in}\left\{1 - \frac{2\mu}{m_p}\left[\sqrt{\left(1+\frac{\mu^2}{m_p^2}\right)\left(1-\frac{m_p^2}{E_{in}^2}\right)} - \frac{\mu}{m_p}\right]\right\} \tag{D.3}$$

with the threshold condition for E_{in}:

$$E_{in} \geq \sqrt{m_p^2 + \mu^2} \tag{D.4}$$

References

[1] Wigner E. P.,*On unitary representations of inhomogeneous Lorentz group*, Ann. Math. **40**, 149-204 (1939)

[2] Shirokov Iu. M., *A group-theoretical consideration of the basis of quantum mechanics. I. The general properies of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group*, Soviet Phys. JETP **6**, 664-673 (1958)
II. *Classification of the irreducible representations of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group*, **ibid**, **6**, 919-928 (1958)
III. *Irreducible representations of classes P_0 and O_0, and the non-completely-reducible representations of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group*, **ibid**, **6**, 929-935 (1958)

[3] Bargmann V., *Irreducible unitary representations of the Lorentz group*, Ann. Math. **48**, 568-640 (1947)

[4] Wigner E. P., *Invariant quantum mechanical equations of motion*, in a book *Theoretical Physics*, pp. 59-82, I.A.E.A., Vienna, (1963)

[5] Bilaniuk O. M. P., Deshpande V. K., Sudarshan E. C. G., *"Meta"-relativity*, Amer. J. Phys. **30**, 718-723 (1962)

[6] Feinberg G., *Possibility of faster-than-light particles*, Phys.Rev. **159**, 1089-1105 (1967)

[7] Newton R. G., *Causality effects of particles that travel faster than light*, Phys. Rev., **162**, 1274 (1967)

[8] Rolnick W. B., *Implication of causality for faster-than-light matter*, Phys. Rev. **183**, 1105-1108 (1969)

[9] Parmentola J. A., Lee D. D. H., *Peculiar properties of tachyon signals*, Phys. Rev. D **4**, 1912-1915 (1971)

[10] Einstein A., *Über die vom Relativitätsprinzip geforderte Trägheit der Energie*, Ann. d. Phys. (Vierte Folge) **23**, 371-384 (1907).

[11] Tolman R. C., *The Theory of Relativity of Motion*, p. 54, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley (1917)

[12] Møller C., *The Theory of Relativity*, p. 52, Oxford Univ. Press (1952)

[13] Bohm D., *The Special Relativity*, p. 155, Addison-Wesley, New York (1965)

[14] Nielsen H. B., *Tachyons in field theory*, in a book *Tachyons, Monopoles and Related Topics*, pp. 169-174, Recami E. ed., North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam (1978)

[15] Perepelitsa V. F., *Causality, relativity and faster-than-light signals*, in a book *Philosophical Problems of the Hypothesis of Superluminal Velocities*, pp. 40-64, Nauka Press, Moscow (1986) (in Russian)

[16] Pavšič M., Recami E., Ziino G., *Recovering causality for tachyons even in macrophysics*, Lett. Nuovo Cim., **17**, 257-261 (1976)
Pavšič M., Recami E., *How to recover causality for tachyons even in macrophysics*, Nuovo Cim. A **36**, 171-186 (1976); erratum **46**, 298 (1978)
Recami E., Fontana F., Garavaglia A., *About superluminal motions and special relativity: a discussion of some recent experiments, and the solution of the causal paradoxes*, arXiv:0709.2453 (2007)

[17] Misner C. W., Thorne K. S., Wheeler J. A., *Gravitation*, p. 30, Freeman, San-Francisco (1973)

[18] Davies P. C. W., *Some cosmological consequencies of imaginary mass*, Nuovo Cimento B **25**, 571-580 (1975)

[19] Narlikar J. V., Sudarshan E. C. G., *Tachyons and cosmology*, Month. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **175**, 105-116 (1976); Sudarshan E. C. G., Narlikar J. V., *Tachyons and cosmology*, Texas Univ. preprint, CPT-ORO-240 (1975)

[20] Landau L. D., Lifshitz E. M., *Theoretical Physics*, vol.2, (*Classical Theory of Fields*), Sect. 112, Addison-Wesley, New York, (1985)

[21] **ibid**, Sect. 82

[22] Walstad A., *Tachyons in an expanding universe*, Found. Phys. **9**, 371-374 (1979)

[23] Landau L. D., Lifshitz E. M., *Theoretical Physics*, vol.2, (*Classical Theory of Fields*), Sect 4, Addison-Wesley, New York (1985)

[24] Coleman S., Glashow S. L. *Cosmic ray and neutrino tests of special relativity*, Phys. Lett. B **405**, 249-252 (1997)

[25] Coleman S., Glashow S. L. *High-energy tests of Lorentz invariance*, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 116008-1−116008-14 (1999)

[26] Kostelecky V. A., Russel N., *Data tables for Lorentz and CPT violation*, Rev. Mod. Phys., **83**, 11-31 (2011)

[27] Mattingly D., *Modern tests of Lorentz invariance*, Living Rev. Rel., **5**, 5-84; arXiv:gr-gc/0502097 (2005)

[28] Perepelitsa V. F., *Tachyon Michelson experiment*, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 471-473 (1977)

[29] Particle Data Group, Chinese Physics C **38**, No.9, p. 369 (2014)

[30] Perepelitsa V. F., *Search for tachyons in e^+e^- annihilation*, ITEP 76-156 (1976) (in Russian)

[31] Boulware D. G., *Unitarity and interacting tachyons*, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 2426-2427 (1970)

[32] Arons M. E., Sudarshan E. C. G., *Lorentz-invariance, local field theory and faster-than-light particles*, Phys. Rev. **173**, 1622-1628 (1968)

[33] Dhar J., Sudarshan E. C. G., *Quantum field theory of interacting tachyons*, Phys. Rev. **174**, 1808-1825 (1968)

[34] Jacobson T., Tsamis N. C., Woodard R. P., *Tachyons and perturbative unitarity*, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 1823-1834 (1988)

[35] Boreskov K. G., private communication, 1981.

[36] Camenzind M., *Tachyonic matter*, in a book *Tachyons, Monopoles and Related Topics*, pp. 89-98, Recami E. ed., North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam (1978)

[37] Rühl W., *Classical fields on spacelike mass shells*, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 791-798 (1969)

[38] Sudarshan E. C. G., Mukunda N., *Quantum theory of the infinite-component Majorana field and the relation of spin and statistics*, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 571-583 (1970)

[39] Hamamoto S., *Quantization of free tachyon fields and possibility of superluminal urbaryon model*, Progr. Theor. Phys. **48**, 1037 (1972)

[40] Barut A. O., *Space-like states in relativistic quantum theory*, in a book *Tachyons, Monopoles and Related Topics*, pp. 143-157, Recami E. ed., North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam (1978)

[41] Sudarshan E. C. G., *Tachyons and the search for a preferred frame*, in a book *Tachyons, Monopoles and Related Topics*, pp. 43-46, Recami E. ed., North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam (1978)

[42] Feinberg G., *Lorentz-invariance of tachyon theories*, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 1651-1660 (1978)

[43] Terletskii Ya. P., *Stringlike solutions of nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation*, Sov. Phys. Doklady **22**, 566 (1977)

[44] Particle Data Group, Chinese Physics C **38**, No.9, p. 549 ?? (2014)

[45] Boreskov K. G., private communication (1974)

[46] Liebscher D. E., *Newton's first law and the existence of tachyons*, Annalen der Physik **32**, 363-365 (1975)

[47] Tuckmantel J., *Synchrotron radiation damping in the LHC and longitudinal bunch shape*, http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/858155/files/lhc-project-report-819.pdf (2005)

[48] Baltay C., Feinberg G., Yeh N., Linsker R., *Search for uncharged faster-than-light particles*, Phys Rev. D **1**, 759-770 (1970)

[49] Danburg G. S., Kalbfleish G. R., Borenstein S. E. et al., *Search for ionizing tachyon pairs from 2.2 GeV/c K^-p interactions*, Phys. Rev. D **4**, 53 (1971)

[50] Perepelitsa V. F., *Search for tachyon production in π^-p interactions at 4.5 GeV/c*, ITEP 87-164 (1987) (in Russian); see also Perepelitsa V. F., Mel'nichenko I. A., Krestnikov Yu. S., *Events with apparent electrical charge nonconservation*, Phys. Lett. B **203**, 335-340 (1988)

[51] Alväger T., Kreisler M. N., *Quest for faster-than-light particles*, Phys. Rev. **171**, 1357-1361 (1968)

[52] Davis M. B., Kreisler M. N., Alväger T., *Search for faster-than-light particles*, Phys. Rev. **183**, 1132-1133 (1969)

[53] OPERA Collaboration, Adam T. et al., *Measurement of the neutrino velocity with the OPERA detector in the CNGS beam*, arXiv:hep-ex/11094897 (2011)

[54] Dirac P. A. M., *Note on exchange phenomena in the Thomas atom*, Math. Proc. Cambr. Phil. Soc. **26**, 376-385 (1930)

[55] Stückelberg E. C. G., *La Mecanique du point materiel in theorie de relativite et en theorie des quanta*, Helv. Phys. Acta **15**, 23-37 (1942)

[56] Feynman R. P., *The theory of positrons*, Phys. Rev. **76**, 749-759 (1949)